

Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with variable coefficients and unbounded potentials

Haruya Mizutani*

Abstract

The present paper is concerned with Schrödinger equations with variable coefficients and unbounded electromagnetic potentials, where the kinetic energy part is a long-range perturbation of the flat Laplacian and the electric (resp. magnetic) potential can grow subquadratically (resp. sublinearly) at spatial infinity. We prove sharp (local-in-time) Strichartz estimates, outside a large compact ball centered at origin, for any admissible pair including the endpoint. Under the nontrapping condition on the Hamilton flow generated by the kinetic energy, global-in-space estimates are also studied. Finally, under the nontrapping condition, we prove Strichartz estimates with an arbitrarily small derivative loss without asymptotic flatness on the coefficients.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study sharp (local-in-time) Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with variable coefficients and unbounded electromagnetic potentials. More precisely, we consider the following Schrödinger operator:

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d (-i\partial_j - A_j(x))g^{jk}(x)(-i\partial_k - A_k(x)) + V(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $d \geq 1$ is the spatial dimension. Throughout the paper we assume that g^{jk}, V and A_j are smooth and real-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and that $(g^{jk}(x))_{j,k}$ is symmetric and positive definite:

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^d g^{jk}(x)\xi_j\xi_k \geq c|\xi|^2, \quad x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with some $c > 0$. Moreover, we suppose the following condition:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35Q41, 35B45; Secondary 35S30, 81Q20.

Key words and phrases. Schrödinger equation, Strichartz estimates, asymptotically flat metric, unbounded electromagnetic potentials.

*Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan. E-mail: hmizutan@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp. The author is supported by GCOE ‘Fostering top leaders in mathematics’, Kyoto University.

Assumption 1.1. There exists $\mu \geq 0$ such that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x^\alpha (g^{jk}(x) - \delta_{jk})| &\leq C_\alpha \langle x \rangle^{-\mu-|\alpha|}, \\ |\partial_x^\alpha A_j(x)| &\leq C_\alpha \langle x \rangle^{1-\mu-|\alpha|}, \\ |\partial_x^\alpha V(x)| &\leq C_\alpha \langle x \rangle^{2-\mu-|\alpha|}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it is well known that H admits a unique self-adjoint realization on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which we denote by the same symbol H . By the Stone theorem, H generates a unique unitary propagator e^{-itH} on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that the solution to the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\partial_t u(t) = Hu(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}; \quad u|_{t=0} = \varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

is given by $u(t) = e^{-itH}\varphi$.

In order to explain the purpose of the paper more precisely, we recall some known results. Let us first recall well known properties of the free propagator e^{-itH_0} , where $H_0 = -\Delta/2$. The distribution kernel of e^{-itH_0} is given explicitly by $(2\pi it)^{-d/2} e^{i|x-y|^2/(2t)}$ and $e^{-itH_0}\varphi$ thus satisfies the dispersive estimate:

$$\|e^{-itH_0}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C|t|^{-d/2}\|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad t \neq 0.$$

Moreover, e^{-itH_0} enjoys the following (global-in-time) Strichartz estimates:

$$\|e^{-itH_0}\varphi\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where (p, q) satisfies the following admissible condition:

$$p \geq 2, \quad \frac{2}{p} = d \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q} \right), \quad (d, p, q) \neq (2, 2, \infty). \quad (1.1)$$

Strichartz estimates imply that, for any $\varphi \in L^2$, $e^{-itH_0}\varphi \in \bigcap_{q \in Q_d} L^q$ for a.e. $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $Q_1 = [2, \infty]$, $Q_2 = [2, \infty)$ and $Q_d = [2, 2d/(d-2)]$ for $d \geq 3$. These estimates hence can be regarded as L^p -type smoothing properties of Schrödinger equations, and have been widely used in the study of nonlinear Schrödinger equations (see, *e.g.*, [8]). Strichartz estimates for e^{-itH_0} were first proved by Strichartz [32] for a restricted pair of (p, q) with $p = q = 2(d+2)/d$, and have been generalized for (p, q) satisfying (1.1) and $p \neq 2$ by [15]. The endpoint estimate $(p, q) = (2, 2d/(d-2))$ for $d \geq 3$ was obtained by [20].

For Schrödinger operators with electromagnetic potentials, *i.e.*, $H = \frac{1}{2}(-i\partial_x - A)^2 + V$, (short-time) dispersive and (local-in-time) Strichartz estimates have been extended with potentials decaying at infinity [34] or growing at infinity [13, 35]. In particular, it was shown by [13, 35] that if $g^{jk} = \delta_{jk}$, V and A satisfy Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$ and all derivatives of the magnetic field $B = dA$ are of short-range type, then $e^{-itH}\varphi$ satisfies (short-time) dispersive estimates:

$$\|e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C|t|^{-d/2}\|\varphi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

for sufficiently small $t \neq 0$. Local-in-time Strichartz estimates, which have the forms

$$\|e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_T\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad T > 0,$$

are immediate consequences of this estimate and the TT^* -argument due to Ginibre-Velo [12] (see Keel-Tao [15] for the endpoint estimate). For the case with singular electric potentials or with supercritical electromagnetic potentials, we refer to [34, 36, 38, 9]. We mention that global-in-time dispersive and Strichartz estimates for scattering states have been also studied under suitable decaying conditions on potentials and assumptions for zero energy; see [19, 37, 30, 12, 10] and reference therein. We also mention that there is no result on sharp global-in-time dispersive estimates for magnetic Schrödinger equations.

On the other hand, the influence of the geometry on the behavior of solutions to linear and nonlinear partial differential equations has been extensively studied. From this geometric viewpoint, sharp local-in-time Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with variable coefficients (or, more generally, on manifolds) have recently been investigated by many authors under several conditions on the geometry ; see, *e.g.*, [31, 6, 26, 16, 4, 3, 7, 24] and reference therein. In [31], [26], [4] authors studied the case on the Euclidean space with nontrapping asymptotically flat metrics. The case on the nontrapping asymptotically conic manifold was studied by [16] and [24]. In [3] the author considered the case of nontrapping asymptotically hyperbolic manifold. For the trapping case, it was shown in [6] that Strichartz estimates with a loss of derivative $1/p$ hold on any compact manifolds without boundaries. They also proved that the loss $1/p$ is optimal in the case on $\mathbb{S}^d$. In [4], [3] and [24], authors proved sharp Strichartz estimates, outside a large compact set, without the nontrapping condition. More recently, it was shown in [7] that sharp Strichartz estimates still hold for the case with hyperbolic trapped trajectories of sufficiently small fractal dimension. We mention that there are also several works on global-in-time Strichartz estimates in the case of long-range perturbations of the flat Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^d$ ([5, 33, 23]).

While (local-in-time) Strichartz estimates are well studied subjects for both of these two cases (at least under the nontrapping condition), the literature is more sparse for the mixed case. In this paper we give a unified approach to a combination of these two kinds of results. More precisely, under Assumption 1.1 with $\mu > 0$, we prove (1) sharp local-in-time Strichartz estimates, outside a large compact set centered at origin, without the nontrapping condition; (2) the global-in-space estimates with the nontrapping condition. Under the nontrapping condition and Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$, we also show local-in-time Strichartz estimates with an arbitrarily small derivative loss. We mention that all results include the endpoint estimates $(p, q) = (2, 2d/(d - 2))$ for $d \geq 3$. This is a natural continuation of author's previous work [25], which was concerned with the non-endpoint estimates for the case with at most linearly growing potentials.

$F(*)$ denotes the characteristic function designated by $(*)$. We now state the main result.

Theorem 1.2 (Strichartz estimates near infinity). *Suppose that H satisfies Assumption 1.1 with $\mu > 0$. Then, for any $T > 0$, $p \geq 2$, $q < \infty$ and $2/p = d(1/2 - 1/q)$ and for sufficiently large $R > 0$, we have*

$$\|F(|x| > R)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_T \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $C_T > 0$ may be taken uniformly with respect to R .

To state the result on global-in-space estimates, we recall the *nontrapping condition*. Let us

denote by $k(x, \xi)$ denotes the classical kinetic energy:

$$k(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d g^{jk}(x) \xi_j \xi_k,$$

and by $(y_0(t, x, \xi), \eta_0(t, x, \xi))$ the Hamilton flow generated by $k(x, \xi)$:

$$\dot{y}_0(t) = \partial_\xi k(y_0(t), \eta_0(t)), \quad \dot{\eta}_0(t) = -\partial_x k(y_0(t), \eta_0(t)); \quad (y_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (x, \xi).$$

Note that the Hamiltonian vector field H_k , generated by k , is complete on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ since (g^{jk}) satisfies the uniform elliptic condition. Hence, $(y_0(t, x, \xi), \eta_0(t, x, \xi))$ exists for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 1.3. We say that $k(x, \xi)$ satisfies the nontrapping condition if for any $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with $\xi \neq 0$,

$$|y_0(t, x, \xi)| \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty. \quad (1.3)$$

The second result is the following.

Theorem 1.4 (Global-in-space Strichartz estimates). *Suppose that H satisfies Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$. Let $T > 0$, $p \geq 2$, $q < \infty$ and $2/p = d(1/2 - 1/q)$. Then, for any $r > 0$, there exists $C_{T,r} > 0$ such that*

$$\|F(|x| < r)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_{T,r} \|\langle H \rangle^{1/p} \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (1.4)$$

Moreover if we assume in addition that $k(x, \xi)$ satisfies the nontrapping condition (1.3), then

$$\|F(|x| < r)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_{T,r} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (1.5)$$

In particular, combining with Theorem 1.2, we have (global-in-space) Strichartz estimates

$$\|e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_T \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

under the nontrapping condition (1.3), provided that $\mu > 0$.

When $\mu \geq 0$ we have the following partial result.

Theorem 1.5 (Near sharp estimates without asymptotic flatness). *Suppose that H satisfies Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$ and $k(x, \xi)$ satisfies the nontrapping condition (1.3). Let $T > 0$, $p \geq 2$, $q < \infty$ and $2/p = d(1/2 - 1/q)$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C_{T,\varepsilon} > 0$ such that*

$$\|e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_{T,\varepsilon} \|\langle H \rangle^\varepsilon \varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

There are some remarks.

Remark 1.6. (1) The estimates of forms (1.2), (1.4) and (1.5) have been proved by [31, 4] when $A \equiv 0$ and V is of long-range type. Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 hence are regarded as generalizations of their results for the case with growing electromagnetic potential perturbations.

(2) The only restriction for admissible pairs, in comparison to the flat case, is to exclude $(p, q) = (4, \infty)$ for $d = 1$, which is due to the use of the Littlewood-Paley decomposition.

(3) The missing derivative loss $\langle H \rangle^\varepsilon$ in Theorem 1.5 is due to the use of the following local smoothing effect (due to Doi [11]):

$$\|\langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\varepsilon} \langle D \rangle^{1/2} e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_{T,\varepsilon} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

It is well known that this estimate does not hold when $\varepsilon = 0$ even for $H = H_0$. We would expect that Theorem 1.2 still holds true for the case with critical electromagnetic potentials in the following sense:

$$\langle x \rangle^{-1} |\partial_x^\alpha A_j(x)| + \langle x \rangle^{-2} |\partial_x^\alpha V(x)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|},$$

(at least if g^{jk} satisfies the bounds in Assumption 1.1 with $\mu > 0$). However, this is beyond our techniques (see, also remark 4.2).

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proofs of Theorems 1.2, 1.4 and 1.5. Throughout the paper we use the following notations: $\langle x \rangle$ stands for $\sqrt{1 + |x|^2}$. We write $L^q = L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if there is no confusion. For Banach spaces X and Y , we denote by $\|\cdot\|_{X \rightarrow Y}$ the operator norm from X to Y . We write $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. We denote the set of multi-indices by $\mathbb{Z}_+^d$. We denote by K the kinetic energy part of H and by H_0 the free Schrödinger operator:

$$K = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} \partial_j g^{jk}(x) \partial_k, \quad H_0 = -\frac{1}{2} \Delta = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j^2.$$

$p(x, \xi)$ denotes the classical total energy (modulo lower order terms):

$$p(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d g^{jk}(x) (\xi_j - A_j(x)) (\xi_k - A_k(x)) + V(x).$$

For $h \in (0, 1]$ we consider $H^h := h^2 H$ as a semiclassical Schrödinger operator with h -dependent electromagnetic potentials $h^2 V$ and $h A_j$. We denote the corresponding total energy by $p_h(x, \xi)$:

$$p_h(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d g^{jk}(x) (\xi_j - h A_j(x)) (\xi_k - h A_k(x)) + h^2 V(x).$$

Before starting the details of the proofs, we here describe the main ideas. At first we remark that, since our Hamiltonian H is not bounded below in general, the Littlewood-Paley decomposition associated with H does not hold for any $p > 2$. To overcome this difficulty, we consider the following partition of unity on the phase space $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$:

$$\psi_\varepsilon(x, \xi) + \chi_\varepsilon(x, \xi) = 1,$$

where ψ_ε is supported in $\{(x, \xi); \langle x \rangle < \varepsilon |\xi|\}$ for some sufficiently small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. It is easy to see that the total energy $p(x, \xi)$ is elliptic on $\text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon$:

$$C^{-1} |\xi|^2 \leq p(x, \xi) \leq C |\xi|^2, \quad (x, \xi) \in \text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon,$$

and we hence can prove a Littlewood-Paley type decomposition of the following form:

$$\|\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)u\|_{L^q} \leq C_q \|u\|_{L^2} + C_q \left(\sum_{h=2^{-j}, j \geq 0} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h) f(h^2 H) u\|_{L^q}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where $2 \leq q < \infty$, $\{f(h^{2\cdot}); h = 2^{-j}, j \geq 0\}$ is a 4-adic partition of unity on $[1, \infty)$ and a_h is an appropriate h -dependent symbol supported in $\{|x| < 1/h, |\xi| \in I\}$ for some open interval $I \Subset (0, \infty)$, $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)$ and $\text{Op}_h(a_h)$ denote the corresponding pseudodifferential and semiclassical pseudodifferential operators, respectively.

Then, the idea of the proof of Theorem 1.2 is as follows. In view of the above Littlewood-Paley estimate, the proof is reduced to that of Strichartz estimates for $F(|x| > R) \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH}$ and $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH}$. In order to prove Strichartz estimates for $F(|x| > R) \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH}$, we use semiclassical approximations of Isozaki-Kitada type. We however note that because of the unboundedness of potentials with respect to x , it is difficult to construct directly such approximations. To overcome this difficulty, we introduce a modified Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$ due to [38] so that $\tilde{H} = H$ for $|x| \leq L/h$ and $\tilde{H} = K$ for $|x| \geq 2L/h$ for some constant $L \geq 1$. Then, $\tilde{H}^h = h^2 \tilde{H}$ can be regarded as a “long-range perturbation” of the semiclassical free Schrödinger operator $H_0^h = h^2 H_0$. We also introduce the corresponding classical total energy $\tilde{p}_h(x, \xi)$ so that $\tilde{p}_h(x, \xi) = p_h(x, \xi)$ for $|x| \leq L/h$ and $\tilde{p}_h(x, \xi) = k(x, \xi)$ for $|x| \geq 2L/h$. Let $a_h^\pm$ be supported in outgoing and incoming regions $\{R < |x| < 1/h, |\xi| \in I, \pm \hat{x} \cdot \hat{\xi} > 1/2\}$, respectively, so that $F(|x| > R) a_h = a_h^+ + a_h^-$, where $\hat{x} = x/|x|$. Rescaling $t \mapsto th$, we first construct the semiclassical approximations for $e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*$ of the following forms

$$e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^* = J_h(S_h^\pm, b_h^\pm) e^{-itH_0^h/h} J_h(S_h^\pm, c_h^\pm)^* + O(h^N), \quad 0 \leq \pm t \leq 1/h,$$

respectively, where $S_h^\pm$ solve the Eikonal equation associated to $\tilde{p}_h$ and $J_h(S_h^\pm, b_h^\pm)$ and $J_h(S_h^\pm, c_h^\pm)$ are associated semiclassical Fourier integral operators. The method of the construction is similar to as that of Robert [28]. On the other hand, we will see that if $L \geq 1$ is large enough, then the Hamilton flow generated by $\tilde{p}_h$ with initial conditions in $\text{supp } a_h^\pm$ cannot escape from $\{|x| \leq L/h\}$ for $0 < \pm t \leq 1/h$, respectively, *i.e.*,

$$\pi_x(\exp tH_{\tilde{p}_h}(\text{supp } a_h^\pm)) \subset \{|x| \leq L/h\}, \quad 0 < \pm t \leq 1/h.$$

Since $\tilde{p}_h = p_h$ for $|x| \leq L/h$, we have

$$\exp tH_{\tilde{p}_h}(\text{supp } a_h^\pm) = \exp tH_{p_h}(\text{supp } a_h^\pm), \quad 0 < \pm t \leq 1/h.$$

We thus can expect (at least formally) that the corresponding two quantum evolutions are approximately equivalent modulo some smoothing operator. We will prove the following rigorous justification of this formal consideration:

$$\|(e^{-itH^h/h} - e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h}) \text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_M h^M, \quad 0 \leq \pm t \leq 1/h, \quad M \geq 0,$$

where $H^h = h^2 H$. By using such approximations for $e^{-itH^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*$, we prove local-in-time dispersive estimates for $\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm) e^{-itH} \text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*$:

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm) e^{-itH} \text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C |t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < h \ll 1, \quad 0 < |t| < 1.$$

Strichartz estimates follow from these estimates and the abstract Theorem due to Keel-Tao [20].

Strichartz estimates for $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH}$ follow from the following short-time dispersive estimate:

$$\|\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon |t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| < t_\varepsilon \ll 1.$$

To prove this, we construct an approximation for $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*$ of the following form:

$$\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^* = J(\Psi, a) + O_{H^{-\gamma} \rightarrow H^\gamma}(1), \quad |t| < t_\varepsilon,$$

where the phase function $\Psi = \Psi(t, x, \xi)$ is a solution to a time-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi equation associated to $p(x, \xi)$ and $J(\Psi, a)$ is the corresponding Fourier integral operator. In the construction, the following fact plays an important role:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (x, \xi) \in \text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon, \quad |\alpha + \beta| \geq 2.$$

We note that if $(g^{jk})_{jk} - \text{Id}_d \neq 0$ depends on x then these bounds do not hold without such a restriction of the initial condition. Using these bounds, we can follow a classical argument due to [21] and construct an approximation for $e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*$ of the form $J(\Psi, b)$ modulo some smoothing term. Next, using an Egorov type lemma, we will prove that $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)(e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^* - J(\Psi, b))$ still can be considered as an “error” term.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is based on a standard idea by [31, 6, 4]. Strichartz estimates with loss follow from semiclassical Strichartz estimates up to time scales of order h , which can be verified by the standard argument. Moreover, under the nontrapping condition, we will prove that the missing $1/p$ derivative loss can be recovered by using local smoothing effects due to Doi [11].

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is based on a slight modification of that of Theorem 1.4. By virtue of the Strichartz estimates for $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}$ and the Littlewood-Paley decomposition, it suffices to show

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q)} \leq h^{-\varepsilon}\|\varphi\|_{L^2}, \quad 0 < h \ll 1.$$

To prove this estimate, we first prove semiclassical Strichartz estimates for $\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}$ up to time scales of order $h \inf |x|$. The proof is based on a refinement of the standard WKB approximation for the semiclassical propagator $\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH^h/h}$. Combining semiclassical Strichartz estimates with a partition of unity argument with respect to x , we will obtain the following Strichartz estimate with an inhomogeneous error term:

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q)} \leq C_T\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C\|\langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\varepsilon}h^{-1/2-\varepsilon}\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)},$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$, which, combined with local smoothing effects, implies Theorem 1.5.

The paper is organized as follows. We first record some known results on the semiclassical pseudodifferential calculus and prove the above Littlewood-Paley decomposition in Section 2. Using dispersive estimates, which will be studied in Sections 4 and 5, we shall prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 3. We construct approximations of Isozaki-Kitada type and prove dispersive estimates for $\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)e^{-itH}\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*$ in Section 4. Section 5 discuss the dispersive estimates for $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*$. The proof of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 are given in Section 6 and Section 7, respectively.

Acknowledgements. We would like to express his sincere thanks to Erik Skibsted for valuable discussions and for hospitality at Institut for Matematiske Fag, Aarhus Universitet, where a part of this work was carried out.

2 Semiclassical functional calculus

Throughout this section we assume Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$, *i.e.*,

$$|\partial_x^\alpha g^{jk}(x)| + \langle x \rangle^{-1} |\partial_x^\alpha A_j(x)| + \langle x \rangle^{-2} |\partial_x^\alpha V(x)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|}. \quad (2.1)$$

The goal of this section is to prove a Littlewood-Paley type decomposition under suitable restriction on the initial data. At first we record (without proof) some known results on the pseudodifferential calculus which will be used throughout the paper. We refer to [27, 22] for the details of the proof.

2.1 Pseudodifferential calculus

For the metric $g = dx^2/\langle x \rangle^2 + d\xi^2/\langle \xi \rangle^2$ and a weight function $m(x, \xi)$ on the phase space $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, we use Hörmander's symbol class notation $S(m, g)$, *i.e.*, $a \in S(m, g)$ if and only if $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} m(x, \xi) \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-|\beta|}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d.$$

To a symbol $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $h \in (0, 1]$, we associate the semiclassical pseudodifferential operator (h -PDO for short) defined by $\text{Op}_h(a)$:

$$\text{Op}_h(a)f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^d} \int e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi/h} a(x, \xi) f(y) dy d\xi, \quad f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

When $h = 1$ we write $\text{Op}(a) = \text{Op}_h(a)$ for simplicity. The Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem shows that for any symbol $a \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ satisfying $|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta}$, $\text{Op}_h(a)$ is extended to a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, 1]$. Moreover, for any symbol a satisfying

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle \xi \rangle^{-\gamma}, \quad \gamma > d,$$

$\text{Op}(a_h)$ is extended to a bounded operator from $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the following bounds:

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a)\|_{L^q \rightarrow L^r} \leq C_{qr} h^{-d(1/q-1/r)}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq r \leq \infty, \quad (2.2)$$

where $C_{qr} > 0$ is independent of $h \in (0, 1]$. These bounds follow from the Schur lemma and an interpolation (see, *e.g.*, [4, Proposition 2.4]).

For two symbols $a \in S(m_1, g)$ and $b \in S(m_2, g)$, the composition $\text{Op}_h(a)\text{Op}_h(b)$ is also a h -PDO and written in the form $\text{Op}_h(c) = \text{Op}_h(a)\text{Op}_h(b)$ with a symbol $c \in S(m_1 m_2, g)$ given by $c(x, \xi) = e^{ihD_\eta D_z} a(x, \eta)(z, \xi)|_{z=x, \eta=\xi}$. Moreover, $c(x, \xi)$ has the following expansion

$$c = \sum_{|\alpha|=0}^{N-1} \frac{h^{|\alpha|}}{i^{|\alpha|} \alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha a \cdot \partial_x^\alpha b + h^N r_N \text{ with } r_N \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N} m_1 m_2, g). \quad (2.3)$$

The symbol of the adjoint $\text{Op}_h(a)^*$ is given by $a^*(x, \xi) = e^{ihD_\eta D_z} a(z, \eta)|_{z=x, \eta=\xi} \in S(m_1, g)$ which has the expansion

$$a^* = \sum_{|\alpha|=0}^{N-1} \frac{h^{|\alpha|}}{i^{|\alpha|} \alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\alpha a + h^N r_N^* \text{ with } r_N^* \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N} m_1, g). \quad (2.4)$$

2.2 Littlewood-Paley decomposition

As we mentioned in the outline of the paper, H is not bounded below in general and we hence cannot expect that the Littlewood-Paley decomposition associated with H , which is of the form

$$\|u\|_{L^q} \leq C_q \|u\|_{L^2} + C_q \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|f(2^{-2j}H)u\|_{L^q}^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

holds if $q \neq 2$. The standard Littlewood-Paley decomposition associated with H_0 also does not work well in our case, since the commutator of H with the Littlewood-Paley projection $f(2^{-2j}H_0)$ can be grow at spatial infinity. To overcome this difficulty, let us introduce an additional localization as follows. Given a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ and a cut-off function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\varphi \equiv 1$ on $[0, 1/2]$ and $\text{supp } \varphi \subset [0, 1]$, we define $\psi_\varepsilon(x, \xi)$ by

$$\psi_\varepsilon(x, \xi) = \varphi \left(\frac{\langle x \rangle}{\varepsilon |\xi|} \right).$$

It is easy to see that $\{\psi_\varepsilon\}_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1}$ is bounded in $S(1, g)$ and supported in $\{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}; \langle x \rangle < \varepsilon |\xi|\}$. Moreover, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, the total energy $p(x, \xi)$ is uniformly elliptic on the support of ψ_ε and $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)H$ thus is essentially bounded below.

In this subsection we prove a Littlewood-Paley type decomposition on the range of $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)$. We begin with the following proposition which tells us that, for any $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $h \in (0, 1]$, $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)f(h^2H)$ is approximated in terms of the h -PDO.

Proposition 2.1. *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, for any $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, we can construct bounded families $\{a_{h,j}\}_{h \in (0,1]} \subset S(\langle x \rangle^{-j} \langle \xi \rangle^{-j}, g)$, $j \geq 0$, such that*

(1) *$a_{h,0}$ is given explicitly by $a_{h,0}(x, \xi) = \psi_\varepsilon(x, \xi/h)f(p_h(x, \xi))$. Moreover,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp } a_{h,j} &\subset \text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot/h) \cap \text{supp } f(p_h) \\ &\subset \{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}; \langle x \rangle < 1/h, |\xi| \in I\}, \end{aligned}$$

for some open interval $I \Subset (0, \infty)$. In particular, we have

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a_{h,j})\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^q} \leq C_{jq} h^{-d(1/q' - 1/q)}, \quad 1 \leq q' \leq q \leq \infty,$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, 1]$.

(2) For any integer $N > 2d$, we set $a_h = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h^j a_{h,j}$. Then,

$$\|\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)f(h^2H) - \text{Op}_h(a_h)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^q} \leq C_q h^{N/2}, \quad 2 \leq q \leq \infty,$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, 1]$.

The following is an immediate consequence of this proposition.

Corollary 2.2. *For any $2 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $h \in (0, 1]$, $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)f(h^2H)$ is bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and satisfies*

$$\|\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)f(h^2H)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^q} \leq C_q h^{-d(1/2 - 1/q)},$$

where $C_q > 0$ is independent of $h \in (0, 1]$.

Remark 2.3. If $V, A \equiv 0$, then Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 hold without the additional term $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)$. We refer to [6] (for the case on compact manifolds without boundary) and to [4] (for the case with metric perturbations on $\mathbb{R}^d$). For more general cases with Laplace-Beltrami operators non-compact manifolds with ends, we refer to [2, 1].

Proof of Proposition 2.1. We begin with the well-known Helffer-Sjöstrand formula [17]:

$$f(h^2 H) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \bar{z}}(z) (h^2 H - z)^{-1} dz \wedge d\bar{z},$$

where $\tilde{f}(z)$ is an almost analytic extension of $f(\lambda)$. Since $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\tilde{f}(z)$ is also compactly supported and satisfies $\partial_{\bar{z}} \tilde{f}(z) = O(|\text{Im } z|^M)$ for any $M > 0$. We shall construct a semiclassical approximation of $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)(h^2 H - z)^{-1}$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty)$. Although the method is based on the standard semiclassical parametrix construction (see, e.g., [27, 6]), we give the details of the proof since we consider the composition of the PDO, $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)$, which is not in the semiclassical regime, with the semiclassical resolvent $(h^2 H - z)^{-1}$.

$p(x, \xi)$ and $p_1(x, \xi)$ denote the principal symbol and the subsymbol of H , respectively, i.e., $H = p(x, D) + p_1(x, D)$. (2.1) and the support property of ψ_ε imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p(x, \xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{2-|\beta|}, \\ |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p_1(x, \xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-1-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{1-|\beta|}, \quad (x, \xi) \in \text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, we obtain

$$\sum_{j,k} (|g^{jk}(x) \xi_j A_k(x)| + |g^{jk}(x) A_j(x) A_k(x)|) + |V(x)| \leq C\varepsilon |\xi|^2, \quad (x, \xi) \in \text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of x, ξ and ε . This estimate and the uniform ellipticity of k imply that $p(x, \xi)$ is also uniformly elliptic on $\text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon$:

$$C_1^{-1} |\xi|^2 \leq p(x, \xi) \leq C_1 |\xi|^2, \quad (x, \xi) \in \text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon,$$

provided that $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. Then, for any integer $N \geq 0$, we can find symbols $q_{h,j}(z, x, \xi)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, and $r_{h,N}(z, x, \xi)$, depending holomorphically on $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Op}(q_{h,j}(z))(h^2 H - z) + \text{Op}(r_{h,N}(z)).$$

More precisely, $q_{h,0}$ is given explicitly by

$$q_{h,0}(z, x, \xi) = \frac{\psi_\varepsilon(x, \xi)}{h^2 p(x, \xi) - z}.$$

Using (2.5) and the fact that $\psi_\varepsilon \in S(1, g)$, we obtain

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta q_{h,0}(z, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \sum_{0 \leq l \leq |\beta| + |\alpha|} \frac{\langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{2l-|\beta|} h^{2l}}{|h^2 p(x, \xi) - z|^{l+1}}.$$

On the other hand, assuming $|z| \leq 1$ without loss of generality and using the uniform ellipticity of $p(x, \xi)$ (on $\text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon$), we learn that for $(x, \xi) \in \text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon$,

$$\frac{1}{|h^2 p(x, \xi) - z|^l} \leq \begin{cases} |\text{Im } z|^{-l} & \text{if } h|\xi| \leq 2C_1, \\ |h\xi|^{-2l} & \text{if } h|\xi| \geq 2C_1. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

These two estimates imply

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta q_{h,0}(z, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \begin{cases} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-|\beta|} |\text{Im } z|^{-1-|\alpha+\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \leq 2C_1, \\ \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} h^{|\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \geq 2C_1. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

We next consider $q_{h,1}$ which is defined by

$$q_{h,1}(z, x, \xi) = \frac{h^2 i \partial_\xi q_{h,0}(z, x, \xi) \cdot \partial_x p(x, \xi) - h^2 q_{h,0}(z, x, \xi) \cdot p_1(x, \xi)}{h^2 p(x, \xi) - z}.$$

A similar calculation as that for $q_{h,0}$ yields

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta q_{h,1}(z, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \begin{cases} \langle x \rangle^{-1-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-|\beta|} h |\text{Im } z|^{-2-|\alpha+\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \leq 2C_1, \\ \langle x \rangle^{-1-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-1} h^{|\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \geq 2C_1. \end{cases}$$

For $j \geq 2$, $q_{h,j}$ are defined inductively by

$$q_{h,j}(h^2 p - z) = - \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+k=j, \\ |\alpha| \geq 1}} \frac{i^{-|\alpha|} h^2}{\alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha q_{h,k} \cdot \partial_x^\alpha p - \sum_{|\alpha|+k=j-1} \frac{i^{-|\alpha|} h^2}{\alpha!} \partial_\xi^\alpha q_{h,k} \cdot \partial_x^\alpha p_1.$$

Iterating the above procedure, we have

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta q_{h,j}(z, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \begin{cases} \langle x \rangle^{-j-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-|\beta|} h^j |\text{Im } z|^{-n(j)-|\alpha+\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \leq 2C_1, \\ \langle x \rangle^{-j-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-j} h^{|\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \geq 2C_1, \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

for some integer $n(j) > 0$. Moreover, $q_{h,j}$ are of the forms

$$q_{h,j} = \sum_{k=0}^{N_j} \frac{q_{h,jk}(x, \xi)}{(h^2(p, x, \xi) - z)^{k+1}},$$

where $N_j \leq 2j - 1$ and $q_{h,jk}(x, \xi)$ satisfy $\text{supp } q_{h,jk} \subset \text{supp } \psi_\varepsilon$ and

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta q_{h,jk}(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta jk} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{2k} h^{2k} \max(\langle \xi \rangle^{-|\beta|} h^j, \langle \xi \rangle^{-j} h^{|\beta|}), \quad (2.9)$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, 1]$. By virtue of (2.8), for any $0 \leq \gamma \leq N$ and for some integer $n(N) > 0$, the remainder $r_{h,N}(z)$ satisfies

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta r_{h,N}(z, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \begin{cases} \langle x \rangle^{-N-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-\gamma-|\beta|} h^{N-\gamma} |\text{Im } z|^{-n(N)-|\alpha+\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \leq 2C_1, \\ \langle x \rangle^{-N-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N+\gamma} h^{\gamma+|\beta|} & \text{if } h|\xi| \geq 2C_1. \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

By the Helffer-Sjöstrand formula, $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon) f(h^2 H)$ can be brought to the form

$$\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon) f(h^2 H) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \text{Op}(\tilde{a}_{h,j}) + R(h, N),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{a}_{h,0}(x, \xi) &= \psi_\varepsilon(x, \xi) f(h^2 p(x, \xi)), \\ \tilde{a}_{h,j}(x, \xi) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_j} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} q_{h,jk}(x, \xi) \frac{d^k f}{d\lambda^k}(h^2 p(x, \xi)), \quad 1 \leq j \leq N-1, \\ R(h, N) &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \bar{z}}(z) \text{Op}(r_{h,N}(z)) (h^2 H - z)^{-1} dz \wedge d\bar{z}.\end{aligned}$$

By definition, $\tilde{a}_{h,j}$ are supported in $\{(x, \xi); |x| < \varepsilon|\xi|, C_0^{-1}/h \leq |\xi| \leq C_0/h\}$ with some $C_0 > 0$. Moreover, it follows from (2.9) that $\tilde{a}_{h,j} \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-j} \langle \xi \rangle^{-j}, g)$. We now define $a_{h,j}(x, \xi) = h^{-j} \tilde{a}_{h,j}(x, \xi/h)$. Taking $\varepsilon > 0$ smaller if necessary, we see that

$$\text{supp } a_{h,j} \subset \psi_\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot/h) f(p_h) \subset \{(x, \xi); |x| < 1/h, C_0^{-1} \leq |\xi| \leq C_0\},$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta a_{h,j}| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-j-|\alpha|} h^{-j-|\beta|} \langle \xi/h \rangle^{-j-|\beta|} \\ &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} (h + |\xi|)^{-j-|\beta|} \\ &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} (2C_0)^{j+|\beta|} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-|\beta|},\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, 1]$, since $|\xi| \geq C_0^{-1}$ on $\text{supp } a_{h,j}$. In particular, $\{a_{h,j}\}_{h \in (0,1]}$ are bounded in $S(\langle x \rangle^{-j} \langle \xi \rangle^{-j}, g)$. By virtue of (2.2), we obtain

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a_{h,j})\|_{L^{q'} \rightarrow L^q} \leq C_{jq} h^{-d(1/q' - 1/q)}, \quad 1 \leq q' \leq q \leq \infty,$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, 1]$. Finally, we shall check the estimate on the remainder. Choosing $N > 2d + 1$ and $\gamma = N/2$ and using (2.10), we have

$$\|\text{Op}(r_{h,N}(z))\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^q} \leq C_q h^{N/2} |\text{Im } z|^{-n(N)}, \quad 2 \leq q \leq \infty.$$

Using the bound $\|(h^2 H - z)^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq |\text{Im } z|^{-1}$, we conclude that

$$\|R(h, N)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^q} \leq C_{Nq} h^{N/2} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \left| \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial \bar{z}}(z) \right| \frac{1}{|\text{Im } z|^{n(N)+1}} dz \wedge d\bar{z} \leq C_{Nq} h^{N/2},$$

which complete the proof. $\square$

Consider a 4-adic partition of unity:

$$f_0(\lambda) + \sum_h f(h^2 \lambda) = 1, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $f_0, f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\text{supp } f_0 \subset [-1, 1]$, $\text{supp } f \subset [1/4, 4]$ and $\sum_h$ means that, in the sum, h takes all negative powers of 2 as values, *i.e.*, $\sum_h = \sum_{h=2^{-j}, j \geq 0}$. Let $F \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that $\text{supp } F \in [1/8, 8]$ and $F \equiv 1$ on $\text{supp } f$. The spectral decomposition theorem implies

$$1 = f_0(H) + \sum_h f(h^2 H) = f_0(H) + \sum_h F(h^2 H) f(h^2 H).$$

Let $a_h \in S(1, g)$ be as in Proposition 2.1 with $f = F$. Using Proposition 2.1, we obtain a Littlewood-Paley type estimates on a range of $\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)$.

Proposition 2.4. *For any $2 \leq q < \infty$,*

$$\|\text{Op}(\psi_\varepsilon)u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_q \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + C_q \left(\sum_h \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)f(h^2H)u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. The proof is same as that of [6, Corollary 2.3] and we omit details. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and ψ_ε be as above and $\chi_\varepsilon = 1 - \psi_\varepsilon$. Let $\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \rho(x)| \leq C_\alpha \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d.$$

Then, for any $T > 0$ and any (p, q) satisfying $p \geq 2, q < \infty$ and $2/p = d(1/2 - 1/q)$, there exists $C_T > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} &\leq C_T \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + C \|\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \\ &\quad + C \left(\sum_h \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}f(h^2H)\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where a_h is given by Proposition 2.1 with ψ_ε replaced by $\rho\psi_\varepsilon$. In particular, $a_h(x, \xi)$ is supported in $\text{supp } \rho(x)\psi(x, \xi/h)F(p_h(x, \xi))$.

Proof. This proposition follows from the L^2 -boundedness of e^{-itH} , Propositions 2.1 and 2.4 (with ψ_ε replaced by $\rho\psi_\varepsilon$) and the Minkowski inequality. $\square$

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 under Assumption 1.1 with $\mu > 0$. We first state two key estimates which we will prove in later sections. For $R > 0$, an open interval $I \Subset (0, \infty)$ and $\sigma \in (-1, 1)$, we define the outgoing and incoming regions $\Gamma^\pm(R, I, \sigma)$ by

$$\Gamma^\pm(R, I, \sigma) := \left\{ (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}; |x| > R, |\xi| \in I, \pm \frac{x \cdot \xi}{|x||\xi|} > -\sigma \right\},$$

respectively. We then have the following (local-in-time) dispersive estimates:

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that H satisfies Assumption 1.1 with $\mu > 0$. Let $I \Subset (0, \infty)$ and $\sigma \in (-1, 1)$. Then, for sufficiently large $R \geq 1$, small $h_0 > 0$ and any symbols $a_h^\pm \in S(1, g)$ supported in $\Gamma^\pm(R, I, \sigma) \cap \{x; |x| < 1/h\}$, we have*

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)e^{-itH}\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C|t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| \leq 1,$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$.

We prove this proposition in Section 4. In the region $\{|x| \gtrsim |\xi|\}$, we have the following (short-time) dispersive estimates:

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that H satisfies Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$. Let us fix arbitrarily $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, there exists $t_\varepsilon > 0$ such that, for any symbol $\chi_\varepsilon \in S(1, g)$ supported in $\{(x, \xi); \langle x \rangle \geq \varepsilon|\xi|\}$, we have*

$$\|\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon|t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| \leq t_\varepsilon.$$

We prove this proposition in Section 5.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first note that, for any $T > T_0 > 0$,

$$\|e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq CTT_0^{-1}\|e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T_0,T_0];L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))},$$

since e^{-itH} is unitary on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Taking $\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $0 \leq \rho(x) \leq 1$, $\rho(x) = 1$ for $|x| \geq 1$ and $\rho(x) = 0$ for $|x| \leq 1/2$, we set $\rho_R(x) = \rho(x/R)$. In order to prove Theorem 1.2, it suffices to show

$$\|\rho_R e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T,T];L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

for sufficiently large $R \geq 1$ and small $T > 0$. Let a_h be as in Proposition 2.1. Replacing ψ_ε with $\rho_R \psi_\varepsilon$ and taking $\varepsilon > 0$ smaller if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $\text{supp } a_h \subset \{(x, \xi); R < |x| < 1/h, |\xi| \in I\}$ for some open interval $I \Subset (0, \infty)$. Choosing $\theta^\pm \in C^\infty([-1, 1])$ so that $\theta^+ + \theta^- = 1$, $\theta^+ = 1$ on $[1/2, 1]$ and $\theta^+ = 0$ on $[-1, -1/2]$, we set $a_h^\pm(x, \xi) = a_h(x, \xi)\theta^\pm(\hat{x} \cdot \hat{\xi})$, where $\hat{x} = x/|x|$. It is clear that $\{a_h^\pm\}_{h \in (0, 1]}$ is bounded in $S(1, g)$ and $\text{supp } a_h^\pm \subset \Gamma^\pm(R, I, 1/2) \cap \{x; |x| < 1/h\}$, and that $a_h = a_h^+ + a_h^-$. We now apply Proposition 3.1 to $a_h^\pm$ and obtain the local-in-time dispersive estimate for $\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)e^{-itH}\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*$ (uniformly in $h \in (0, h_0]$), which, combined with the L^2 -boundedness of $\text{Op}(a_h^\pm)e^{-itH}$ and the abstract Theorem due to Keel-Tao [20], implies Strichartz estimates for $\text{Op}(a_h)e^{-itH}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-1, 1]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} &\leq \sum_{\pm} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-1, 1]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \\ &\leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$. Since $\text{Op}_h(a_h)$ is bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the bound of order $O(h^{-d(1/2-1/q)})$, for $h_0 < h \leq 1$ we have

$$\sum_{h_0 < h \leq 1} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}f(h^2H)\varphi\|_{L^p([-1, 1]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))}^2 \leq C(h_0)\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2.$$

with some $C(h_0) > 0$. Using these two bounds, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_h \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}f(h^2H)\varphi\|_{L^p([-1, 1]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))}^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{0 < h < h_0} \|f(h^2H)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 + C(h_0)\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \\ &\leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Strichartz estimates for $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}$ is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.2. By virtue of Corollary 2.5, we complete the proof. $\square$

4 Semiclassical approximations for outgoing propagators

Throughout this section we assume Assumption 1.1 with $\mu > 0$. We here study the behavior of $e^{-itH}\text{Op}_h(a_h^\pm)^*$, where $a_h^\pm \in S(1, g)$ are supported in $\Gamma^\pm(R, I, \sigma) \cap \{|x| < 1/h\}$, respectively. The main goal of this section is to prove Proposition 3.1. For simplicity, we consider the outgoing propagator $e^{-itH}\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$ only, and the proof for incoming case is analogous.

In order to prove dispersive estimates, we construct a semiclassical approximation for the outgoing propagator $e^{-itH} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*$ by using the method of Isozaki-Kitada. Namely, rescaling $t \mapsto th$ and setting $H^h = h^2 H$, $H_0^h = -h^2 \Delta/2$, we consider an approximation for the semiclassical propagator $e^{-itH^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*$ of the following form

$$e^{-itH^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* = J_h(S_h^+, b_h^+) e^{-itH_0^h/h} J_h(S_h^+, c_h^+)^* + O(h^N), \quad 0 \leq t \leq h^{-1},$$

where S_h^+ solves suitable Eikonal equation in the outgoing region and $J(S_h^+, w)$ is the corresponding semiclassical Fourier integral operator (h -FIO for short):

$$J_h(S_h^+, w)f(x) = (2\pi h)^{-d} \int e^{i(S_h^+(x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi)/h} w(x, \xi) f(y) dy d\xi.$$

Such approximations (uniformly in time) have been studied by [29] for Schrödinger operators with long-range potentials, and by [27, 28, 4] for the case of long-range metric perturbations. We also refer to the original paper by Isozaki-Kitada [18] in which the existence and asymptotic completeness of modified wave operators (with time-independent modifiers) were established for the case of Schrödinger operators with long-range potentials. We note that, in these cases, we do not need the additional restriction of the initial data in $\{|x| < 1/h\}$. The recent paper [25] concerns such approximations (locally in time) for the case of long-range metric perturbations, combined with potentials growing subquadratically at infinity, under the additional restriction in $\{|x| < 1/h\}$. Although the construction is similar as that in the previous papers, we give the details of the proof for reader's convenience.

As we mentioned in the outline of the paper, we first construct an approximation for the modified propagator $e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h}$, where $\tilde{H}^h$ is defined as follows. Taking arbitrarily a cut-off function $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$, $\psi \equiv 1$ for $|x| \leq 1/2$ and $\psi \equiv 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$, we define truncated electric and magnetic potentials, V_h and $A_h = (A_{h,j})_j$ by $V_h(x) := \psi(hx/L)V(x)$, $A_{h,j}(x) = \psi(hx/L)A_j(x)$, respectively. It is easy to see that

$$V_h \equiv V, \quad A_{h,j} \equiv A_j \quad \text{on } \{|x| \leq L/(2h)\}, \quad \text{supp } A_{h,j}, \text{ supp } V_h \subset \{|x| \leq L/h\},$$

and that, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ there exists $C_{L,\alpha} > 0$, independent of x, h , such that

$$h^2 |\partial_x^\alpha V_h(x)| + h |\partial_x^\alpha A_h(x)| \leq C_{\alpha,L} \langle x \rangle^{-\mu - |\alpha|}. \quad (4.1)$$

Let us define $\tilde{H}^h$ by

$$\tilde{H}^h = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d (-ih\partial_j - hA_{h,j}(x)) g^{jk}(x) (-ih\partial_k - hA_{h,k}(x)) + h^2 V_h(x).$$

We consider $\tilde{H}^h$ as a “semiclassical” Schrödinger operator with h -dependent electromagnetic potentials $h^2 V_h$ and hA_h . By virtue of the estimates on g^{jk}, A_h and V_h , $\tilde{H}^h$ can be regarded as a long-range perturbation of the semiclassical free Schrödinger operator $H_0^h = -h^2 \Delta/2$. Such a type modification has been used to prove Strichartz estimates and local smoothing effects for Schrödinger equations with superquadratic potentials (see, Yajima-Zhang [38, Section 4]). Let us denote by $\tilde{p}_h$ the corresponding energy:

$$\tilde{p}_h(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^d g^{jk}(x) (\xi_j - hA_{h,j}(x)) (\xi_k - hA_{h,k}(x)) + h^2 V_h(x).$$

The following proposition, which was proved by [28], provides the existence of the phase function of h -FIO's.

Proposition 4.1. *Let us fix arbitrarily open intervals $I \Subset (0, \infty)$, $-1 < \sigma < 1$ and $L > 0$. Then, there exist $R_0, h_0 > 0$ and a family of smooth and real-valued functions $\{S_h^+; 0 < h \leq h_0, R \geq R_0\} \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d}; \mathbb{R})$ satisfying the Eikonal equation associated to $\tilde{p}_h$:*

$$\tilde{p}_h(x, \partial_x S_h^+(x, \xi)) = |\xi|^2/2, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Gamma^+(R, I, \sigma), \quad (4.2)$$

such that

$$|S_h^+(x, \xi) - x \cdot \xi| \leq C \langle x \rangle^{1-\mu}, \quad x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.3)$$

Moreover, for any $|\alpha + \beta| \geq 1$,

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (S_h^+(x, \xi) - x \cdot \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \min\{R^{1-\mu-|\alpha|}, \langle x \rangle^{1-\mu-|\alpha|}\}, \quad x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.4)$$

Here $C, C_{\alpha\beta} > 0$ are independent of x, ξ, R and h .

Proof. We only give the sketch of the proof and refer to [28, Section 4] for more details. Let us fix $I \Subset I_0 \Subset (0, \infty)$ and $\sigma < \sigma_0 < 1$. Let $(x_h(t, x, \xi), \xi_h(t, x, \xi)) = \exp t H_{\tilde{p}_h}(x, \xi)$ be the Hamilton flow generated by $\tilde{p}_h$, i.e., the solution to

$$\frac{dx_h}{dt} = \frac{\partial \tilde{p}_h}{\partial \xi}, \quad \frac{d\xi_h}{dt} = -\frac{\partial \tilde{p}_h}{\partial x}; \quad (x_h, \xi_h)|_{t=0} = (x, \xi). \quad (4.5)$$

Using (4.1), we have the following a priori bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} |x_h(t, x, \xi)| &\geq C(|x| + |t|), \\ |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (x_h(t, x, \xi) - x - t\xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-\mu-|\alpha|} |t|, \\ |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\xi_h(t, x, \xi) - \xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-\mu-|\alpha|}, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $t \geq 0$, $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma^+(R/2, I_0, \sigma_0)$ and $h \in (0, h_0]$, provided that $R \geq 1$ is large enough and $h_0 > 0$ is small enough. Using these bounds, we see that, for any fixed $t \geq 0$, the map $(x, \xi) \mapsto (x, \xi_h(t, x, \xi))$ is a diffeomorphism from $\Gamma^+(R/2, I_0, \sigma_0)$ onto its range and has the inverse map $(x, \xi) \mapsto (x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi))$ which is well-defined on $[0, \infty) \times \Gamma^+(R, I, \sigma)$. We note that η_h satisfies the same estimates as that for ξ_h . It is easy to see that, for any $t \geq s \geq 0$, the flow

$$s \mapsto (x_h(s, x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi)), \xi_h(s, x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi)))$$

is a solution to (4.5) with the conditions $x_h(0, x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi)) = x$, $\xi_h(t, x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi)) = \xi$. By the same argument as that in [14, Lemma 2.4], we have, for any $0 < \mu' < \mu$,

$$\partial_x[x_h(s, x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi))] = O(1), \quad \partial_x[\xi_h(s, x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi))] = O(\langle x \rangle^{-1-\mu'}),$$

uniformly in $t \geq s \geq 0$ and $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma^+(R, I, \sigma)$. Then, by the standard Hamilton-Jacobi theory, we can find the corresponding generator $\Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi)$, that is a solution to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation:

$$\partial_t \Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi) = \tilde{p}_h(x, \partial_x \Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi)); \quad \Psi_h^+(0, x, \xi) = x \cdot \xi,$$

satisfying $(\partial_x \Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi), \partial_\xi \Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi)) = (\eta_h(t, x, \xi), x_h(t, x, \eta_h(t, x, \xi)))$.

We set $F_h(t, x, \xi) = \Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi) - \Psi_h^+(t, R\xi, \xi)$. Then, using a priori bounds for $x_h(t)$, $\xi_h(t)$, $\eta_h(t)$ and $x_h(t, x, \eta_h(t))$, we have $\partial_t F_h \in L^1([0, \infty)_t)$ and hence can define $S_h^+(x, \xi)$ on $\Gamma^+(R, I, \sigma)$ by

$$S_h^+(x, \xi) = x \cdot \xi + \int_0^\infty \partial_t F_h(t, x, \xi) dt.$$

Since $\partial_x S_h^+ = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \partial_x \Psi_h^+(t)$ and $\partial_\xi \Psi_h^+(t) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, by using the energy conservation

$$\tilde{p}_h(x, \partial_x \Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi)) = \tilde{p}_h(\partial_\xi \Psi_h^+(t, x, \xi), \xi),$$

we can check that S_h^+ satisfies the Eikonal equation (4.2). Moreover, using a priori bounds on x_h, ξ_h and η_h , we obtain (4.3) and (4.4). Finally, we extend S_h^+ to the whole space $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ so that $S_h^+ = x \cdot \xi$ outside $\Gamma^+(R/2, I_0, \sigma_0)$ and complete the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.2. We remark that, in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we did not use the support properties of A_h and V_h . Suppose that A and V satisfy Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$, i.e., $\langle x \rangle^{-1} |\partial_x^\alpha A(x)| + \langle x \rangle^{-2} |\partial_x^\alpha V(x)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|}$. If g^{jk} is of long-range type, then we still can construct the solution S_h^+ to (4.2), by using the support properties of A_h and V_h , provided that if $L > 0$, being independent of h , is small enough. However, in this case, $S_h^+ - x \cdot \xi$ behaves like $\langle x \rangle^{1-\mu} h^{-1}$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, and we cannot obtain the uniform L^2 -boundedness of the corresponding h -FIO. This is one of the reason why we exclude the critical case $\mu = 0$.

To the phase S_h^+ as in Proposition 4.1 and an amplitude $a \in S(1, g)$, we associate the h -FIO defined by

$$J_h(S_h^+, a)f(x) = (2\pi h)^{-d} \int e^{i(S_h^+(x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi)/h} a(x, \xi) f(y) dy d\xi.$$

Using (4.4), for sufficiently large $R > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\xi \otimes \partial_x S_h^+(x, \xi) - \text{Id}| &\leq C \langle R \rangle^{-\mu} < 1/2, \\ |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta S_h^+(x, \xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \text{ for } |\alpha + \beta| \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, h_0]$. Therefore, the standard L^2 -boundedness of FIO implies that $J_h(S_h^+, a)$ is uniformly bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$.

We now construct the outgoing approximation for $e^{-itH^h/h}$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let us fix arbitrarily open intervals $I \Subset I_0 \Subset I_1 \Subset I_2 \Subset (0, \infty)$, $-1 < \sigma < \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < 1$ and $L > 0$. Let R_0 and h_0 be as in Proposition 4.1 with I, σ replaced by I_2, σ_2 , respectively. Then, for every integer $N \geq 0$, the followings hold uniformly with respect to $R \geq R_0$ and $h \in (0, h_0]$.*

(1) *There exists a symbol*

$$b_h^+ = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h^j b_{h,j}^+ \quad \text{with} \quad b_{h,j}^+ \in S(1, g), \quad \text{supp } b_{h,j}^+ \subset \Gamma^+(R^{1/3}, I_1, \sigma_1),$$

such that, for any $a^+ \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } a^+ \subset \Gamma^+(R, I, \sigma)$, we can find

$$c_h^+ = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h^j c_{h,j}^+ \quad \text{with} \quad c_{h,j}^+ \in S(1, g), \quad \text{supp } c_{h,j}^+ \subset \Gamma^+(R^{1/2}, I_0, \sigma_0),$$

such that, for all $0 \leq t \leq h^{-1}$, $e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a^+)^*$ can be brought to the form

$$e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a^+)^* = J_h(S_h^+, b_h^+) e^{-itH_0^h/h} J_h(S_h^+, c_h^+)^* + Q_{\text{IK}}^+(t, h, N),$$

where $J_h(S_h^+, w)$, $w = b_h^+, c_h^+$, are h -FIO's associated to the phase S_h^+ defined in Proposition 4.1 with R, I and σ replaced by $R^{1/4}, I_2, \sigma_2$, respectively. Moreover, for any integer $s \geq 0$ with $2s \leq N - 1$, the remainder $Q_{\text{IK}}^+(t, h, N)$ satisfies

$$\| \langle D \rangle^s Q_{\text{IK}}^+(t, h, N) \langle D \rangle^s \|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_N s h^{N-2s-1}, \quad (4.6)$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $0 \leq t \leq h^{-1}$.

(2) Let $K_{S_h^+}(t, x, y)$ be the distribution kernel of $J_h(S_h^+, b_h^+) e^{-itH_0^h/h} J_h(S_h^+, c_h^+)^*$. Then, $K_{S_h^+}$ satisfies dispersive estimates:

$$|K_{S_h^+}(t, x, y)| \leq C |th|^{-d/2}, \quad (4.7)$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 \leq t \leq h^{-1}$.

Proof. We give only details of the construction of amplitudes and the proof of (4.6). Dispersive estimates can be verified by the same argument as that in [4, Lemma 4.4].

By virtue of (2.4), there exist $\tilde{a}^+ \in S(1, g)$ and $q_0(N) \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N}, g)$ such that $\text{supp } \tilde{a}^+ \subset \text{supp } a^+$ and $\text{Op}_h(a^+)^* = \text{Op}_h(\tilde{a}^+) + h^N \text{Op}_h(q_0(N))$. Setting $J_a = J_h(S_h^+, b_h^+)$ and $J_b = J_h(S_h^+, c_h^+)$, we have the Duhamel formula:

$$e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} J_a J_b^* = J_a e^{-itH_0^h/h} J_b^* - \frac{i}{h} \int_0^t e^{-i(t-\tau)\tilde{H}^h/h} \left(\tilde{H}^h J_a - J_a H_0^h \right) e^{-isH_0^h/h} J_b^* d\tau.$$

We shall construct the amplitudes b_h^+, c_h^+ so that b_h^+ satisfies transport equations associated to S_h^+ , and that $J_a J_b^*$ is a microlocal approximation of $\text{Op}_h(\tilde{a}^+)$ in the following sense:

$$\| \text{Op}_h(\tilde{a}^+) - J_a J_b^* \|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_N h^N. \quad (4.8)$$

The estimates (4.6) can be proved by using the method of non-stationary phase.

Construction of the amplitudes. $b_{h,j}^+$ can be constructed by a standard method of characteristics as follows. Recall that K and $k(x, \xi)$ denote the kinetic part of H and the corresponding energy, respectively:

$$K = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} \partial_j g^{jk}(x) \partial_k, \quad k(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} g^{jk}(x) \xi_j \xi_k.$$

We let $X_h^+(x, \xi) = (\partial_\xi k)(x, \partial_x S_h^+(x, \xi))$ and consider the flow generated by X_h^+ :

$$(\dot{x}_h^+(t, x, \xi)) = X_h^+(x_h^+(t, x, \xi), \xi); \quad x_h^+(0) = x.$$

By (4.3) and (4.4), we learn that $x_h^+(t)$ is well-defined on $[0, \infty) \times \Gamma^+(\tilde{R}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{\sigma})$ with $\tilde{R} = R^{\frac{5}{16}}$ (notice that $1/3 > 5/16 > 1/4$), some $I_1 \Subset \tilde{I} \Subset I_2$ and $\sigma_1 < \tilde{\sigma} < \sigma_2$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x_h^+(t, x, \xi)| &\geq C^{-1}(|x| + |t|), \\ |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (x_h^+(t, x, \xi) - x - t\xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-\mu-|\alpha|} |t|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

uniformly in $t \geq 0$ and $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma^+(\tilde{R}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{\sigma})$ (see, [28]). We let $Y_h^+(x, \xi) = -(KS_h^+)(x, \xi)$. By virtue of (4.3), (4.4) and (4.9), we see that $Y_h^+(x_h^+(t, x, \xi), \xi)$ is integrable with respect to $t \in [0, \infty)$, and that

$$\left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \int_0^\infty Y_h^+(x_h^+(t, x, \xi), \xi) dt \right| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-\mu-|\alpha|}, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Gamma^+(\tilde{R}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{\sigma}).$$

Let us define $\tilde{b}_{h,j}^+ \in S(1, g)$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, inductively by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{b}_{h,0}^+ &= \exp \left(\int_0^\infty Y_h^+(x_h^+(t, x, \xi), \xi) dt \right), \\ \tilde{b}_{h,j}^+ &= i \int_0^\infty (K\tilde{b}_{h,j-1}^+)(x_h^+(t, x, \xi), \xi) \exp \left(\int_0^t Y_h^+(x_h^+(s, x, \xi), \xi) ds \right) dt, \quad j \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

A direct computation shows that $\tilde{b}_{h,j}^+$ solve the following transport equations:

$$\begin{cases} X_h^+ \cdot \partial_x \tilde{b}_{h,0}^+ + Y_h^+ \tilde{b}_{h,0}^+ = 0, \\ X_h^+ \cdot \partial_x \tilde{b}_{h,j}^+ + Y_h^+ \tilde{b}_{h,j}^+ + iK\tilde{b}_{h,j-1}^+ = 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq N-1. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Taking $\rho \in S(1, g)$ satisfying $\rho \equiv 1$ on $\Gamma^+(\tilde{R}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{\sigma})$ and $\text{supp } \rho \subset \Gamma^+(R^{1/3}, I_1, \sigma_1)$, we define $b_{h,j}^+ \in S(1, g)$ by $b_{h,j}^+ = \rho \tilde{b}_{h,j}^+$.

We next construct $c_{h,j}^+$. By definition, $b_{h,0}^+$ is elliptic on $\Gamma^+(\tilde{R}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{\sigma}) (\supset \Gamma^+(R^{1/2}, I_0, \sigma_0))$ in the following sense:

$$b_{h,0}^+ > c, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Gamma^+(\tilde{R}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{\sigma}),$$

with some $c > 0$ being independent of h . The standard FIO theory then shows that, for any $\tilde{a}^+ \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } \tilde{a}^+ \subset \Gamma^+(R, I, \sigma)$, there exist symbols $c_{h,j}^+ \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } c_{h,j}^+ \subset \Gamma^+(R^{1/2}, I_0, \sigma_0)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$, such that (4.8) holds true. Indeed, $c_{h,j}^+$ can be determined by the following triangular system:

$$\overline{c_{h,j}^+(x, \xi)} = \frac{1}{b_{h,0}^+(x, \xi)} \left(r_{h,j}^+(x, \tilde{S}_h^+(x, y, \xi)) J_1 \right) \Big|_{y=x}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1.$$

Here $\tilde{S}_h^+$ and J_1 are defined by

$$\tilde{S}_h^+(x, y, \xi) = \int_0^1 \partial_x S_h^+(y + \theta(x-y), \xi) d\theta, \quad J_1 = |\det \partial_\xi \tilde{S}_h^+(x, y, \xi)|,$$

and $r_{h,0}^+ = \tilde{a}^+(x, \tilde{S}_h^+(x, y, \xi))$. Moreover, if we denote the inverse map of $\xi \mapsto \tilde{S}_h^+(x, y, \xi)$ by $\xi \mapsto [\tilde{S}_h^+]^{-1}(x, y, \xi)$, then $r_{h,j}^+$ is a linear combination of

$$\frac{1}{i^{|\alpha|} |\alpha|!} \left(\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_y^\beta b_{h,k_0}^+(x, [\tilde{S}_h^+]^{-1}(x, y, \xi)) c_{h,k_1}^+(y, [\tilde{S}_h^+]^{-1}(x, y, \xi)) J_2 \right) \Big|_{y=x},$$

where $J_2 = |\det \partial_\xi [\tilde{S}_h^+]^{-1}(x, y, \xi)|$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ and $k_0, k_1 = 0, 1, \dots, j$ so that $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq j$, $k_0 + k_1 = j - |\alpha|$ and $k_1 \leq j-1$. The symbolic calculus then shows that $J_a J_b^*$ is a h -PDO and satisfies

$$J_a J_b^* = \text{Op}_h(\tilde{a}^+) + h^N \text{Op}_h(q_{1,h}(N))$$

for some $\{q_{1,h}(N); h \in (0, h_0]\} \subset S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N}, g)$, which implies (4.8).

Estimates of the remainder. By virtue of (4.2) and (4.10) and the support properties of $b_{h,j}^+$, we see that there exist $d_{h,j}^+ \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-j} \langle \xi \rangle^{-j}, g)$ supported in $\Gamma^+(R^{1/3}, I_1, \sigma_1) \setminus \Gamma^+(\tilde{R}, \tilde{I}, \tilde{\sigma})$ and $q_{2,h}(N) \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N}, g)$ such that

$$e^{iS_h^+/h} \tilde{H}^h \left(e^{-iS_h^+/h} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h^j b_{h,j}^+ \right) - \frac{h^2}{2} \rho^2 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h^j b_{h,j}^+ = \sum_{j=1}^N h^j d_{h,j}^+ + h^{N+1} q_{2,h}(N).$$

Setting $d_h^+ = \sum_{j=1}^N h^j d_{h,j}^+$, we have $\tilde{H}^h J_a - J_a H_0^h = J_h(S_h^+, d_h^+) + h^{N+1} J_h(S_h^+, q_{2,h}(N))$. We denote the distribution kernel of $J_h(S_h^+, d_h^+) e^{i\tau h \Delta/2} J_b^*$ by $q_{3,h}(\tau, x, y)$:

$$q_{3,h}(\tau, x, y) = \int e^{i(S_h^+(x, \xi) - \tau|\xi|^2/2 - S_h^+(y, \xi))/h} d_h^+(x, \xi) \overline{c_h^+(y, \xi)} d\xi.$$

Then, by the same argument as that in [4, Lemma 3.4], we have

$$|\partial_\xi S_h^+(x, \xi) - \tau\xi - \partial_\xi S_h^+(y, \xi)| \geq c(1 + \tau + |x| + |y|), \quad \tau \geq 0, \quad h \in (0, h_0],$$

on the support of the amplitude $d_h^+(x, \xi) \overline{c_h^+(y, \xi)}$, where $c > 0$ is independent of t, x, y and h . Therefore, integrating by parts, we obtain that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta q_{3,h}(\tau, x, y)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta M} h^{M-|\alpha+\beta|} (1 + \tau + |x| + |y|)^{-M+|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad \tau \geq 0,$$

for any $M \geq 0$, uniformly in $\tau \geq 0$ and $h \in (0, h_0]$.

We now come into the proof of (4.6). Combining the ellipticity of g^{jk} with (4.1), we learn that there exists $C_1 > 0$, independent of h , such that

$$\tilde{H}^h + C_1 \geq C_1^{-1} \langle hD \rangle^2, \quad h \in (0, h_0],$$

which implies

$$\| \langle D \rangle^s (\tilde{H}^h + C_1)^{-s/2} \|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_s \| \langle D \rangle^s \langle hD \rangle^{-s} \|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_s h^{-s},$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, h_0]$. Therefore, it remains to show

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1/h} \| (\tilde{H}^h + C_1)^{s/2} Q_{\text{IK}}^+(t, h, N) \langle D \rangle^s \|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N,s} h^{N-2s-1}, \quad h \in (0, h_0].$$

The remainder is of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\text{IK}}^+(t, h, N) &= -h^N e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(q_0(N) + q_{1,h}(N)) \\ &\quad - ih^N \int_0^t e^{-i(t-\tau)\tilde{H}^h/h} J_h(S_h^+, q_{2,h}(N)) e^{-i\tau H_0^h/h} J_b^* ds \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{h} \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)\tilde{H}^h/h} Q_3(\tau, h) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $Q_3(\tau, h)$ is a integral operator with the kernel $q_{3,h}(\tau, x, y)$. Since the total symbol of $(\tilde{H}^h + C_1)^{s/2} \text{Op}_h(q_0(N) + q_{1,h}(N)) \langle hD \rangle^s$ belongs to $S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N+2s}, g)$, the standard L^2 -boundedness of PDO imply

$$\| (\tilde{H}^h + C_1)^{s/2} \text{Op}_h(q_0(N) + q_{1,h}(N)) \langle D \rangle^s \|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N,s} h^{-2s}.$$

Using the L^2 -boundedness of $J_b^* \langle hD \rangle^s = (\langle hD \rangle^s J_b)^*$ (see, [27]), we similarly obtain

$$\|(\tilde{H}^h + C_1)^{s/2} J_h(S_h^+, q_{2,h}(N)) e^{-i\tau H_0^h/h} J_b^* \langle D \rangle^s\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N,s} h^{-2s}.$$

A direct computation yields, for any $M \geq 0$,

$$\|(\tilde{H}^h + C_1)^{s/2} Q_3(\tau, h) \langle D \rangle^s\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{M,s} h^{M-2s}$$

Since $(\tilde{H}^h + C_1)^{s/2}$ commutes with $e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h}$, these three estimates imply the desired estimate. $\square$

The following lemma, which has been essentially proved by [25], tells us that one can still construct the semiclassical approximation for the original propagator $e^{-itH^h/h}$ if we restrict the support of initial data in the region $\Gamma^+(R, J, \sigma) \cap \{x; |x| < h^{-1}\}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that $\{a_h^+\}_{h \in (0,1]}$ is a bounded set in $S(1, g)$ with symbols supported in $\Gamma^+(R, I, \sigma) \cap \{x; |x| < h^{-1}\}$. Then, there exists $L \geq 1$ such that, for any $M, s \geq 0$, $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $0 \leq t \leq h^{-1}$, we have*

$$\|(e^{-itH^h/h} - e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h}) \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* \langle D \rangle^s\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{M,s} h^{M-s},$$

where $C_{M,s} > 0$ is independent of h and t .

In order to prove this lemma, we need the following.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $f_h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$, $|\partial_x^\alpha f(x)| \leq C_\alpha$ uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$, and that $\text{supp } f_h \subset \{|x| \geq L/h\}$. Let $L \geq 1$ be large enough. Then, under the conditions in Lemma 4.4, we have*

$$\|f_h(x) \langle D \rangle^\gamma e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* \langle D \rangle^s\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{M,s,\gamma} h^{M-s-\gamma},$$

for any $s, \gamma \geq 0$ and $M \geq 0$, uniformly with respect $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $0 \leq t \leq 1/h$.

Proof. We apply Theorem 4.3 to $e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*$ and obtain

$$e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* = J_h(S_h^+, b_h^+) e^{-itH_0^h/h} J_h(S_h^+, c_h^+)^* + Q_{\text{IK}}^+(t, h, N).$$

By virtue of (4.6), the remainder $f_h(x) \langle D \rangle^\gamma Q_{\text{IK}}^+(t, h, N) \langle D \rangle^s$ is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the norm dominated by $C_{Ns\gamma} h^{N-\gamma-s-1}$, uniformly with respect $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $t \in [0, 1/h]$. On the other hand, by virtue of (4.4), the phase of distribution kernel of $J_h(S_h^+, b_h^+) e^{-itH_0^h/h} J_h(S_h^+, c_h^+)^*$, which is given by $\Phi_h^+(t, x, y, \xi) = S_h^+(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}t|\xi|^2 - S_h^+(y, \xi)$, satisfies

$$\partial_\xi \Phi_h^+(t, x, y, \xi) = (x - y)(\text{Id} + O(R^{-\mu/4})) - t\xi.$$

We here note that $\text{supp } c_h^+ \subset \{(y, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}; a_h^+(y, \partial_\xi S_h^+(y, \xi)) \neq 0\}$. In particular, $c_h^+(y, \xi)$ vanishes in the region $\{y; |y| \geq 1/h\}$. We now set $L = 2\sqrt{\sup I_2} + 2$, where I_2 is given in Theorem 4.6. Since $|x| \geq L/h$, $|y| < 1/h$ and $|\xi|^2 \in I_2$ on the support of the amplitude $f_h(x) b_h^+(x, \xi) c_h^+(y, \xi)$, we obtain

$$|\partial_\xi \Phi_h^+(t, x, y, \xi)| > c(1 + |x| + |y| + |\xi| + t + h^{-1}), \quad 0 \leq t \leq h^{-1},$$

for some universal constant $c > 0$. The assertion now follows from an integration by parts and the L^2 -boundedness of h -FIO's. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4.4. For simplicity, we use the notation $S(m, g_0)$ with the metric $g_0 = dx^2/\langle x \rangle^2$, i.e., $f \in S(m, g_0)$ if and only if $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\partial_x^\alpha f(x) = O(m(x)\langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|})$. At first we note that $\tilde{H}^h \in S(\langle \xi \rangle^2 + \langle x \rangle^{1-\mu}\langle \xi \rangle, g) + S(\langle x \rangle^{2-\mu}, g_0)$. The Duhamel formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} (e^{-itH^h/h} - e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h}) &= -\frac{i}{h} \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H^h/h} W_0^h e^{-is\tilde{H}^h/h} ds \\ &= -\frac{i}{h} \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H^h/h} e^{-is\tilde{H}^h/h} W_0^h ds \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h^2} \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H^h/h} \int_0^s e^{-i(s-\tau)H^h/h} [\tilde{H}^h, W_0^h] e^{-i\tau\tilde{H}^h/h} d\tau ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_0^h = H^h - \tilde{H}^h$ consists of the following two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{ih^2}{2} \sum_{j,k} \left(\partial_j g^{jk} (1 - \psi(hx/L)) A_k + (1 - \psi(hx/L)) A_j g^{jk} \partial_k \right), \\ &\frac{h^2}{2} \sum_{j,k} (1 - \psi(hx/L))^2 g^{jk} (1 - \psi(hx/L)) A_j A_k + (1 - \psi(hx/L)) V. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $W_0^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{1-\mu}\langle \xi \rangle, g) + S(\langle x \rangle^{2-\mu}, g_0)$ and its coefficients are supported in $\{|x| \geq L/h\}$. By the support properties of a_h^+ and W_0^h , we have

$$\|W_0^h \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_M h^M,$$

for any $M \geq 0$, provided that $L > 1$. Since the second term of W_0^h commutes with V_h , a symbolic calculus yields that $[\tilde{H}^h, W_0^h]$ is decomposed into three parts: $W_{01}^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-\mu}\langle \xi \rangle^2, g)$, $W_{02}^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{1-\mu}\langle \xi \rangle, g)$ and $W_{03}^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{2-2\mu}, g_0)$. We set $W_1^h = W_{02}^h + W_{03}^h$. By the Duhamel formula, we have

$$W_1^h e^{-i\tau\tilde{H}^h/h} = e^{-i\tau\tilde{H}^h/h} W_1^h + \frac{i}{h} \int_0^\tau e^{-i(\tau-u)\tilde{H}^h/h} [\tilde{H}^h, W_1^h] e^{-iu\tilde{H}^h/h} du.$$

By the support properties of a_h^+ and W_1^h , we have

$$\|W_1^h \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_M h^M \text{ for any } M \geq 0.$$

Again, by the symbolic calculus, we can write $[\tilde{H}^h, W_1^h] = W_{11}^h + W_{12}^h + W_{13}^h$, where $W_{11}^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-\mu}\langle \xi \rangle^2, g)$, $W_{12}^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{1-2\mu}\langle \xi \rangle, g)$ and $W_{13}^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{2-3\mu}, g_0)$ (notice that an additional decay factor $\langle x \rangle^{-\mu}$ is in the second and third terms).

Setting $W_2^h = W_{12}^h + W_{13}^h$, we iterate this procedure. Then, we can find a positive number N_μ , depending only on μ , such that $(e^{-itH^h/h} - e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h}) \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*$ can be written in the following form (modulo $O(h^\infty)$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$):

$$\int_{t \geq s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_{N_\mu} \geq 0} e^{-i(t-s_1)H^h/h} e^{-i(s_1-s_{N_\mu})\tilde{H}^h/h} W_{N_\mu}^h e^{-is_{N_\mu}\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* ds_{N_\mu} \dots ds_1,$$

where $W_{N_\mu}^h \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-\mu}\langle \xi \rangle^2 + \langle x \rangle^{-\nu}\langle \xi \rangle, g) + S(\langle x \rangle^{-\nu}, g_0)$ with some $\nu = \nu(\mu, N_\mu) > 0$. Moreover, the coefficients of $W_{N_\mu}^h$ are supported in $\{x; |x| > L/h\}$. We now apply Lemma 4.5 to $W_{N_\mu}^h e^{-is_{N_\mu}\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*$ and obtain the assertion. $\square$

We now come into the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Rescaling $t \rightarrow th$, it suffices to show

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)e^{-itH^h/h}\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon |th|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| \leq h^{-1},$$

where $H^h = h^2 H$. Let $A_h(x, y)$ be the distribution kernel of $\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)$:

$$A_h(x, y) = (2\pi h)^{-d} \int e^{i(x-y)\cdot\xi/h} a_h^+(x, \xi) d\xi.$$

Since $a_h^+ \in S(1, g)$ is compactly supported in I with respect to ξ , we easily see that

$$\sup_x \int |A_h(x, y)| dy + \sup_y \int |A_h(x, y)| dx \leq C, \quad h \in (0, 1].$$

On the other hand, since $\langle \xi \rangle^s a_h^+ \langle \xi \rangle^\gamma \in S(1, g)$ for any s, γ , we have

$$\|\langle D \rangle^s \text{Op}_h(a_h^+) \langle D \rangle^\gamma\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_s h^{-s-\gamma}.$$

Combining these to estimates with Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, we can write

$$\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)e^{-itH^h/h}\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* = K_1(t, h, N) + K_2(t, h, N),$$

where $K_1(t, h, N) = \text{Op}_h(a_h^+)J_h(S_h^+, b_h^+)e^{-itH_0^h/h}J_h(S_h^+, c_h^+)^*$ and its distribution kernel, which we denote by $K_1(t, x, \xi)$, satisfies dispersive estimates:

$$|K_1(t, x, y)| \leq \int |A_h(x, z)| |K_{S_h^+}(t, z, y)| dz \leq C_N |th|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < t \leq h^{-1},$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, h_0]$. On the other hand, since

$$\|\langle D \rangle^s \text{Op}_h(a_h^+) \langle D \rangle^s\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_s h^{-2s}, \quad h \in (0, 1],$$

(4.6) and Lemma 4.4 imply

$$\|\langle D \rangle^s K_2(t, h, N) \langle D \rangle^s\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N,s} h^{N-2s-1}.$$

If we choose $N \geq d/2 + 2$, then it follows from the Sobolev embedding that the distribution kernel of $K_2(t, h, N)$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $0 < t \leq h^{-1}$. Therefore, $\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)e^{-itH^h/h}\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^*$ has the distribution kernel $K(t, x, y)$ satisfying dispersive estimates for $0 < t \leq h^{-1}$:

$$|K(t, x, y)| \leq C_N |th|^{-d/2}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.11)$$

Finally, using the following relation,

$$\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)e^{-itH^h/h}\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* = \left(\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)e^{itH^h/h}\text{Op}_h(a_h^+)^* \right)^*,$$

we learn $K(t, x, y) = \overline{K(-t, y, x)}$ and (4.11) also holds for $0 < -t \leq h^{-1}$. For the incoming case, the proof is analogous and we omit it. $\square$

5 Fourier integral operators with time dependent phase

Throughout this section we assume Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$. Consider a symbol $\chi_\varepsilon \in S(1, g)$ supported in a region

$$\Omega(\varepsilon) := \{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}; \langle x \rangle > \varepsilon|\xi|/2\},$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small fixed constant. In this section we prove the following dispersive estimate:

$$\|\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C_\varepsilon |t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| \leq t_\varepsilon,$$

where $t_\varepsilon > 0$ is a small constant depending on ε . This estimate, combined with the L^2 -boundedness of $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)$ and e^{-itH} , implies Strichartz estimates for $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}$.

Let us give a short summary of the steps of proof. Recall that $p(x, \xi)$ denotes the total energy. Choose $\chi_\varepsilon^* \in S(1, g)$ so that $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon^* = \text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon$ and $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^* = \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*) + \text{Op}(r_N)$ with some $r_N \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N}, g)$ for sufficiently large $N > d/2$. We first construct an approximation for $e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*)$ in terms of the FIO with a time dependent phase:

$$J(\Psi, b^N)f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(\Psi(t, x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi)} b(t, x, \xi) f(y) dy d\xi,$$

where Ψ is a generating function of the Hamilton flow associated to $p(x, \xi)$ and $(\partial_\xi \Psi, \xi) \mapsto (x, \partial_x \Psi)$ is the corresponding canonical map, and the amplitude $b = b_0 + b_2 + \dots + b_{N-1}$ solves the corresponding transport equations. Although such parametrix constructions are well known as WKB approximations (at least if χ_ε^* is compactly supported in ξ and the time scale depends on the size of frequency), we give the detail of proof since, in the present case, $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon^*$ is not compact with respect to ξ and t_ε is independent of the size of frequency. The crucial point is that $p(x, \xi)$ is of *quadratic type* on $\Omega(\varepsilon)$:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon), \quad |\alpha + \beta| \geq 2,$$

which allows us to follow a classical argument (due to, *e.g.*, [21]) and construct the approximation for $|t| < t_\varepsilon$ if $t_\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. The composition $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)J(\Psi, b)$ is also a FIO with the same phase, and a standard stationary phase method can be used to prove dispersive estimates for $0 < |t| < t_\varepsilon$. It remains to obtain the $L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty$ bounds of the remainders $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH} \text{Op}(r_N)$ and $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}(\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*) - J(\Psi, b^N))$. If e^{-itH} maps from the Sobolev space $H^{d/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to itself, then $L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty$ bounds are direct consequences of the Sobolev embedding and L^2 -boundedness of PDO. However, our Hamiltonian H is not bounded below (on $\{|x| \gtrsim |\xi|\}$) and such a property does not hold in general. To overcome this difficulty, we use an Egorov type lemma as follows. By the Sobolev embedding and the Littlewood-Paley decomposition, the proof is reduced to that of the following estimates:

$$\sum_{j \geq 0} \|2^{j\gamma} S_j(D) \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH} \text{Op}(r_N) \langle D \rangle^\gamma f\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \|f\|_{L^2}^2, \quad (5.1)$$

where $\gamma > d/2$ and S_j is a dyadic partition of unity. Then, we will prove that there exists $\eta_j(t, \cdot, \cdot) \in S(1, g)$ such that

$$2^j \leq C(1 + |x| + |\xi|) \quad \text{on } \text{supp } \eta_j(t),$$

and that

$$S_j(D) \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} = e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\eta_j(t)) + O_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}(2^{-jN}), \quad |t| < t_\varepsilon \ll 1.$$

Choosing $\delta > 0$ with $\gamma + \delta \leq N/2$, we learn that $2^{j(\gamma+\delta)} \eta_j(t) r_N \langle \xi \rangle^\gamma \in S(1, g)$ and hence (5.1). $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} (\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*) - J(\Psi, b))$ can be controlled similarly.

5.1 Short-time behavior of Hamilton flow

This subsection discusses the classical mechanics generated by $p(x, \xi)$. We denote the solution to the following Hamilton equations by $(X(t), \Xi(t)) = (X(t, x, \xi), \Xi(t, x, \xi))$:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{X}_j = \frac{\partial p}{\partial \xi_j}(X, \Xi) = \sum_k g^{jk}(X) (\Xi_k - A_k(X)), \\ \dot{\Xi}_j = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial x_j}(X, \Xi) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l} \frac{\partial g^{kl}}{\partial x_j}(X) (\Xi_k - A_k(X)) (\Xi_l - A_l(X)) \\ \quad + \sum_{k,l} g^{kl}(X) \frac{\partial A_k}{\partial x_j}(X) (\Xi_l - A_l(X)) - \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_j}(X) \end{cases}$$

with the initial condition $(X(0), \Xi(0)) = (x, \xi)$, where $\dot{f} = \partial_t f$. We first observe that the flow conserves the energy:

$$p(x, \xi) = p(X(t), \Xi(t)),$$

which implies $k(X, \Xi) = k(x, \xi) + O(|\xi| \langle x \rangle + \langle x \rangle^2 + |\Xi| \langle X \rangle + \langle X \rangle^2)$. Combining with the uniform ellipticity of $k(x, \xi)$, we have

$$|\dot{X}(t)| + |\dot{\Xi}(t)| \leq C(1 + |\xi| + |x| + |X(t)| + |\Xi(t)|).$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality to this estimate, we obtain an a priori bound:

$$|X(t) - x| + |\Xi(t) - \xi| \leq C_T |t| (1 + |x| + |\xi|), \quad |t| \leq T, \quad x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Using this estimate, we obtain more precise behavior of the flow with initial conditions in $\Omega(\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, for sufficiently small $t_\varepsilon > 0$ and all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$,*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (X(t, x, \xi) - x)| + |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\Xi(t, x, \xi) - \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} |t| \langle x \rangle^{1-|\alpha+\beta|},$$

uniformly with respect to $(t, x, \xi) \in (-t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) \times \Omega(\varepsilon)$.

Proof. We only consider the case when $t \geq 0$, the proof for the case $t \leq 0$ is similar. Let $(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon)$. At first we remark that for sufficiently small $t_\varepsilon > 0$,

$$|x|/2 \leq |X(t, x, \xi)| \leq 2|x|, \quad |t| \leq t_\varepsilon. \quad (5.2)$$

For $|\alpha + \beta| = 0$, the assertion is obvious. We let $|\alpha + \beta| = 1$ and differentiate the Hamilton equations with respect to $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta X \\ \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \Xi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x \partial_\xi p(X, \Xi) & \partial_\xi^2 p(X, \Xi) \\ -\partial_x^2 p(X, \Xi) & -\partial_\xi \partial_x p(X, \Xi) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta X \\ \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \Xi \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.3)$$

Using (5.2), we learn that $p(X(t), \Xi(t))$ is of quadratic type in $\Omega(\varepsilon)$:

$$\left| (\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p)(X(t), \Xi(t)) \right| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} \langle x \rangle^{2-|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad (t, x, \xi) \in (-t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) \times \Omega(\varepsilon).$$

All entries of the above matrix hence are uniformly bounded in $(t, x, \xi) \in (-t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) \times \Omega(\varepsilon)$. Taking $t_\varepsilon > 0$ smaller if necessary, integrating (5.3) with respect to t and applying Gronwall's inequality, we have the assertion with $|\alpha + \beta| = 1$. For $|\alpha + \beta| \geq 2$, we prove the estimate for $\partial_{\xi_1}^2 X(t)$ and $\partial_{\xi_1}^2 \Xi(t)$ only, where $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_d)$. Proofs for other cases are similar, and proofs for higher derivatives follow from an induction on $|\alpha + \beta|$. By the Hamilton equation, we learn

$$\frac{d}{dt} \partial_{\xi_1}^2 X(t) = \partial_x \partial_\xi p(X(t), \Xi(t)) \partial_{\xi_1}^2 X(t) + \partial_\xi^2 p(X(t), \Xi(t)) \partial_{\xi_1}^2 \Xi(t) + Q(X(t), \Xi(t)),$$

where $Q(X(t), \Xi(t))$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Q(X(t), \Xi(t)) &\leq C_\varepsilon \sum_{|\alpha+\beta|=3, |\beta|\geq 1} (\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p)(X(t), \Xi(t)) (\partial_{\xi_1} X(t))^{|\alpha|} (\partial_{\xi_1} \Xi(t))^{|\beta|} \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \langle x \rangle^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We similarly obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \partial_{\xi_1}^2 \Xi(t) = -\partial_x^2 p(X(t), \Xi(t)) \partial_{\xi_1}^2 X(t) - \partial_\xi \partial_x p(X(t), \Xi(t)) \partial_{\xi_1}^2 \Xi(t) + O(\langle x \rangle^{-1}).$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality, we have the desired estimates. $\square$

Lemma 5.2. (1) Let $t_\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough. Then, for any $|t| < t_\varepsilon$, the map

$$g(t) : (x, \xi) \mapsto (X(t, x, \xi), \xi)$$

is a diffeomorphism from $\Omega(\varepsilon/2)$ onto its range, and satisfies

$$\Omega(\varepsilon) \subset g(t, \Omega(\varepsilon/2)) \text{ for all } |t| < t_\varepsilon.$$

(2) Let $\Omega(\varepsilon) \ni (x, \xi) \mapsto (Y(t, x, \xi), \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$ be the inverse map of $g(t)$. Then, $Y(t, x, \xi)$ and $\Xi(t, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)$ satisfy the same estimates as that for $X(t, x, \xi)$ and $\Xi(t, x, \xi)$ of Lemma 5.1, respectively:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (Y(t, x, \xi) - x)| + |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\Xi(t, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi) - \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} |t| \langle x \rangle^{1-|\alpha+\beta|},$$

uniformly with respect to $(t, x, \xi) \in (-t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) \times \Omega(\varepsilon)$.

Proof. Choosing a cut-off function $\rho \in S(1, g)$ such that $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$, $\text{supp } \rho \subset \Omega(\varepsilon/3)$ and $\rho \equiv 1$ on $\Omega(\varepsilon/2)$, we modify $g(t)$ as follows:

$$g_\rho(t, x, \xi) = (X_\rho(t, x, \xi), \xi), \quad X_\rho(t, x, \xi) = (1 - \rho(x, \xi))x + \rho(x, \xi)X(t, x, \xi).$$

$g_\rho(t, x, \xi)$ is then obviously smooth with respect to (x, ξ) and Lemma 5.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta g_\rho(t, x, \xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon}, \quad |\alpha + \beta| \geq 1, \\ |J(g_\rho)(t, x, \xi) - \text{Id}| &\leq Ct_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $J(g_\rho)$ is the Jacobi matrix with respect to (x, ξ) . Choosing $t_\varepsilon > 0$ so small that $Ct_\varepsilon < 1/2$, and applying the Hadamard global inverse mapping theorem, we see that, for any fixed $|t| < t_\varepsilon$, $g_\rho(t)$ is a diffeomorphism from $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ onto itself. By definition, $g(t)$ is diffeomorphic from $\Omega(\varepsilon/2)$ onto its range. Since $g_\rho(t)$ is bijective, it remains to check that

$$\Omega(\varepsilon)^c \supset g_\rho(t, \Omega(\varepsilon/2)^c), \quad |t| < t_\varepsilon.$$

Suppose that $(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2)^c$. If $(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/3)^c$, then the assertion is obvious since $g_\rho(t) \equiv \text{Id}$ outside $\Omega(\varepsilon/3)$. If $(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/3) \setminus \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$, then, by Lemma 5.1 and the support property of ρ , we have

$$|X_\rho(t, x, \xi)| \leq |x| + \rho(x, \xi)(X(t, x, \xi) - x) \leq (\varepsilon/2 + C_0 t_\varepsilon) \langle \xi \rangle$$

for some $C_0 > 0$ independent of x, ξ and t_ε . Choosing $t_\varepsilon < \varepsilon/(2C_0)$, we obtain the assertion.

We next prove the estimates on $Y(t)$. Since $(Y(t, x, \xi), \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$, we learn

$$\begin{aligned} |Y(t, x, \xi) - x| &= |X(0, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi) - X(t, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)| \\ &\leq \sup_{(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2)} |X(t, x, \xi) - x| \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon |t| \langle x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$ with $|\alpha + \beta| = 1$, apply $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta$ to the equality $x = X(t, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)$. We then have the following equality

$$A(t, Z(t, x, \xi)) \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (Y(t, x, \xi) - x) = \partial_y^\alpha \partial_\eta^\beta (y - X(t, y, \eta))|_{(y, \eta) = Z(t, x, \xi)},$$

where $Z(t, x, \xi) = (Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)$ and $A(t, Z) = (\partial_x X)(t, Z)$ is a $d \times d$ -matrix. By Lemma 5.1 and a similar argument as that in the proof of Lemma 5.2 (1), we learn that $A(t, Z(t, x, \xi))$ is invertible if $t_\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, and that $A(t, Z(t, x, \xi))$ and $A(t, Z(t, x, \xi))^{-1}$ are bounded uniformly in $(t, x, \xi) \in (-t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) \times \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (Y(t, x, \xi) - x) \right| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} \sup_{(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2)} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (x - X(t, x, \xi))| \\ &\leq C_{\alpha\beta} |t| \langle x \rangle^{1-|\alpha+\beta|}. \end{aligned}$$

Proofs for higher derivatives are obtained by an induction with respect to $|\alpha + \beta|$ and proofs for $\Xi(t, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)$ are similar. $\square$

5.2 The parametrix for $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*$

Before starting the construction of parametrix, we prepare two lemmas. The following is an Egorov type theorem which will be used to control remainder terms. We write $\exp tH_p(x, \xi) = (X(t, x, \xi), \Xi(t, x, \xi))$.

Lemma 5.3. *For $h \in (0, 1]$, consider a h -dependent symbol $\eta_h \in S(1, g)$ such that $\text{supp } \eta_h \subset \Omega(\varepsilon) \cap \{1/(2h) < |\xi| < 2/h\}$. Then, for sufficiently small $t_\varepsilon > 0$, independent of h , and any integer $N \geq 0$, there exists a bounded family of symbols $\{\eta_h^N(t, \cdot, \cdot); |t| < t_\varepsilon, 0 < h \leq 1\} \subset S(1, g)$ such that*

$$\text{supp } \eta_h^N(t, \cdot, \cdot) \subset \exp tH_p(\text{supp } \eta_h),$$

and that

$$\|e^{itH} \text{Op}(\eta_h) e^{-itH} - \text{Op}(\eta_h^N(t))\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_N \varepsilon h^N,$$

uniformly with respect to $0 < h \leq 1$ and $|t| < t_\varepsilon$.

Proof. Let $\eta_h^0(t, x, \xi) = \eta_h(\exp tH_p(x, \xi)) = \eta_h(X(t, x, \xi), \Xi(t, x, \xi))$. It is easy to see that $\text{supp } \eta_h^0 \subset \exp tH_p(\text{supp } \eta_h)$. Moreover, Lemma 5.1 implies that $\{\eta_h^0; 0 \leq t < t_\varepsilon, 0 < h \leq 1\}$ is a bounded subset of $S(1, g)$. By a direct computation, η_h^0 solves

$$\partial_t \eta_h^0 + \{p, \eta_h^0\} = 0; \quad \eta_h^0|_{t=0} = \eta_h,$$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is the Poisson bracket. By a standard pseudodifferential calculus, there exists a bounded set $\{r_h^0(t, \cdot, \cdot); 0 \leq t < t_\varepsilon, 0 < h \leq 1\} \subset S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } r_h^0 \subset \text{supp } \eta_h^0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{Op}(\eta_h^0) + i[H, \text{Op}(\eta_h^0)] = h \text{Op}(r_h^0).$$

We next set

$$\eta_h^1(t, x, \xi) = \int_0^t r_h^0(s, X(s-t, x, \xi), \Xi(s-t, x, \xi)) ds.$$

Again, we learn that $\{\eta_h^1(t, \cdot, \cdot); 0 \leq t < t_\varepsilon, 0 < h \leq 1\} \subset S(1, g)$ is bounded and that $\text{supp } \eta_h^1 \subset \exp tH_p(\text{supp } \eta_h)$ for all $0 \leq t < t_\varepsilon$ and $0 < h \leq 1$. Moreover, η_h^1 solves

$$\partial_t \eta_h^1 + \{p, \eta_h^1\} = r_h^0; \quad \eta_h^1|_{t=0} = 0,$$

which implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{Op}(\eta_h^0 + h\eta_h^1) + i[H, \text{Op}(\eta_h^0 + h\eta_h^1)] = h^2 \text{Op}(r_h^1).$$

with some $\{r_h^1; 0 \leq t < t_\varepsilon, 0 < h \leq 1\} \subset S(1, g)$ and $\text{supp } r_h^1 \subset \text{supp } \eta_h^0$. Iterating this procedure and putting $\eta_h^N = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} h^j \eta_h^j$, we obtain the assertion. For $-t_\varepsilon < t \leq 0$, the proof is analogous. $\square$

Using this lemma, we have the following.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, for any symbol $\chi_\varepsilon \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon \subset \Omega(\varepsilon)$ and any integer $N \geq 0$, there exists $\chi_\varepsilon^* \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon^* \subset \Omega(\varepsilon)$ such that for $2\gamma < N$,*

$$\sup_{|t| < t_\varepsilon} \|\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^* - \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*)\|_{H^{-\gamma}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow H^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_N \gamma \varepsilon$$

Proof. By the expansion formula (2.4), there exists $\chi_\varepsilon^* \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon^* \subset \Omega(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^* = \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*) + \text{Op}(r_0(N))$$

with some $r_0(N) \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N}, g)$. For $\delta > 0$ with $2\gamma + \delta \leq N$, we split

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle D \rangle^\gamma \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \text{Op}(r_0(N)) \langle D \rangle^\gamma \\ &= \langle D \rangle^\gamma \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \langle D \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \cdot \langle x \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} \langle D \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} \text{Op}(r_0(N)) \langle D \rangle^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle x \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} \langle \xi \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} r_0(N) \langle \xi \rangle^\gamma \in S(1, g)$, $\langle x \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} \langle D \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} \text{Op}(r_0(N)) \langle D \rangle^\gamma$ is bounded on L^2 . In order to prove the L^2 -boundedness of the first term, we use the Littlewood-Paley decomposition and Lemma 5.3 as follows. Consider a dyadic partition of unity with respect to the frequency:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} S_j(D) = 1,$$

where $S_j(\xi) = S(2^{-j}\xi)$, $j \geq 1$, with some $S \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ supported in $\{1/2 < |\xi| < 2\}$ and $S_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ supported in $\{|\xi| < 1\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \| \langle D \rangle^\gamma \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \langle D \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} f \|_{L^2} \\ & \leq C \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \| 2^{j\gamma} S_j(D) \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) e^{-itH} \langle D \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} f \|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the expansion formula (2.3), there exists $\eta_j \in S(1, g)$ such that $\text{supp } \eta_j \subset \Omega(\varepsilon) \cap \{2^{j-1} < |\xi| < 2^{j+1}\}$, and that

$$S_j(D) \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon) = \text{Op}(\eta_j) + O_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}(2^{-jN}).$$

By Lemma 5.3 with $h = 2^{-j}$, there exists a symbol $\eta_j^N(t) \in S(1, g)$ such that

$$\text{Op}(\eta_j) e^{-itH} = e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\eta_j^N(t)) + O_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2}(2^{-jN}).$$

Since $N \geq \gamma + \delta$, the remainders satisfy

$$\| 2^{-j(N-\gamma)} e^{-itH} \langle D \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} f \|_{L^2}^2 \leq C 2^{-2j\delta} \| f \|_{L^2}^2.$$

Suppose that $(x, \xi) \in \text{supp } \eta_j^N(t)$. Since $\text{supp } \eta_j^N(t) \subset \exp tH_p(\text{supp } \eta_j)$, we have

$$|X(-t, x, \xi)| > \varepsilon \langle \Xi(-t, x, \xi) \rangle, \quad 2^{j-1} < |\Xi(-t, x, \xi)| < 2^{j+1}.$$

Using Lemma 5.1 with the initial data $(X(-t), \Xi(-t))$, we learn

$$|x - X(-t, x, \xi)| + |\xi - \Xi(-t, x, \xi)| \leq C t_\varepsilon \langle X(-t, x, \xi) \rangle.$$

Combining these two estimates, we see that $(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$ and

$$2^j \leq C(1 + |x| + |\xi|), \quad |t| < t_\varepsilon,$$

with some $C > 0$ independent of x, ξ and t , provided that $t_\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. Therefore, $2^{j(\gamma+\delta)} \eta_j^N(t) \langle \xi \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \in S(1, g)$ and the corresponding PDO is bounded on L^2 . Finally, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \| 2^{j\gamma} \text{Op}(\eta_j) e^{-itH} \langle D \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} f \|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\| 2^{-j\delta} 2^{j(\gamma+\delta)} \text{Op}(\eta_j^N(t)) \langle D \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} f \|_{L^2}^2 + 2^{-2j\delta} \| f \|_{L^2}^2 \right) \\ & \leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-2j\delta} \| f \|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \leq C \| f \|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

We next consider a parametrix construction of $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH}\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*)$. Let us first make the following ansatz:

$$v(t, x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(\Psi(t, x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi)} b^N(t, x, \xi) f(y) dy d\xi,$$

where $b^N = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} b_j$. In order to approximately solve the Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t v(t) = Hu(t); \quad v|_{t=0} = \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon^*)\varphi,$$

the phase function Ψ and the amplitude b^N should satisfy the following Hamilton-Jacobi equation and transport equations, respectively:

$$\partial_t \Psi + p(x, \partial_x \Psi) = 0; \quad \Psi|_{t=0} = x \cdot \xi, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t b_0 + \mathcal{X} \cdot \partial_x b_0 + \mathcal{Y} b_0 = 0; & b_0|_{t=0} = \chi_\varepsilon, \\ \partial_t b_j + \mathcal{X} \cdot \partial_x b_j + \mathcal{Y} a_j + iK b_{j-1} = 0; & b_j|_{t=0} = 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq N-1, \end{cases} \quad (5.5)$$

where K is the kinetic energy part of H and a vector field $\mathcal{X}$ and a function $\mathcal{Y}$ are defined by

$$\mathcal{X}(t, x, \xi) := (\partial_\xi k)(x, \partial_x \Psi(t, x, \xi)), \quad \mathcal{Y}(t, x, \xi) := -(K\Psi)(t, x, \xi).$$

We first construct the phase function Ψ .

Proposition 5.5. *Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily. Then, for sufficiently small $t_\varepsilon > 0$, we can construct a smooth and real-valued function $\Psi \in C^\infty((-t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}; \mathbb{R})$ which solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (5.4) for $(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon)$ and $|t| \leq t_\varepsilon$. Moreover, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$, $x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $|t| \leq t_\varepsilon$,*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\Psi(t, x, \xi) - x \cdot \xi + tp(x, \xi))| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} |t|^2 \langle x \rangle^{2-|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad (5.6)$$

where $C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} > 0$ is independent of x, ξ and t .

Proof. We consider the case when $t \geq 0$, and the proof for $t \leq 0$ is similar. We first define the action integral $\tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)$ on $[0, t_\varepsilon] \times \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$ by

$$\tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) := x \cdot \xi + \int_0^t L(X(s, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi), \Xi(s, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)) ds,$$

where $L(x, \xi) = \xi \cdot \partial_\xi p(x, \xi) - p(x, \xi)$ is the Lagrangian associated to $p(x, \xi)$, and X, Ξ and Y are given by Lemma 5.2 (2) with ε replaced by $\varepsilon/2$. The smoothness of $\tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)$ follows from corresponding properties of $X(t)$, $\Xi(t)$ and $Y(t)$. It is well known that $\tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)$ solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\partial_t \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) + p(x, \partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)) = 0; \quad \Psi|_{t=0} = x \cdot \xi,$$

for $(x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$, and satisfies

$$\partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) = \Xi(t, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi), \quad \partial_\xi \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) = Y(t, x, \xi).$$

Lemma 5.2 (2) shows that $p(Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)$ is of quadratic type:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p(Y(t, x, \xi), \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} \langle x \rangle^{2-|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad (t, x, \xi) \in [0, t_\varepsilon] \times \Omega(\varepsilon/2),$$

which, combined with the energy conservation

$$p(x, \partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)) = p(Y(t, x, \xi), \xi),$$

imply

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) - x \cdot \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} |t| \langle x \rangle^{2-|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad (t, x, \xi) \in [0, t_\varepsilon) \times \Omega(\varepsilon/2).$$

We similarly obtain, for $(t, x, \xi) \in [0, t_\varepsilon) \times \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |p(x, \partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)) - p(x, \xi)| \\ &= \left| \left(\partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) - \xi \right) \cdot \int_0^1 (\partial_\xi p)(x, \theta \partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)) + (1 - \theta) \xi d\theta \right| \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon |t| \langle x \rangle^2, \end{aligned}$$

and, more generally,

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (p(x, \partial_x \tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi)) - p(x, \xi))| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} |t| \langle x \rangle^{2-|\alpha+\beta|}.$$

Therefore, integrating the Hamilton-Jacobi equation with respect to t , we have

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) - x \cdot \xi + tp(x, \xi))| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} |t|^2 \langle x \rangle^{2-|\alpha+\beta|}.$$

Finally, choosing a cut-off function $\rho \in S(1, g)$ so that $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$, $\rho \equiv 1$ on $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ and $\text{supp } \rho \subset \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$, we define

$$\Psi(t, x, \xi) := x \cdot \xi - tp(x, \xi) + \rho(x, \xi) (\tilde{\Psi}(t, x, \xi) - x \cdot \xi + tp(x, \xi)).$$

$\Psi(t, x, \xi)$ clearly satisfies the statement of Proposition 5.5. $\square$

Using the phase function constructed in Proposition 5.5, we can define the FIO, $J(\Psi, a) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'$ by

$$J(\Psi, a)f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(\Psi(t, x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi)} a(x, \xi) f(y) dy d\xi, \quad f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where $a \in S(1, g)$. Moreover, we have the following.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $t_\varepsilon > 0$ be small enough. Then, for any bounded family of symbols $\{a(t); |t| < t_\varepsilon\} \subset S(1, g)$, $J(\Psi, a)$ is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ uniformly with respect to $|t| < t_\varepsilon$:*

$$\sup_{|t| \leq t_\varepsilon} \|J(\Psi, a)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_\varepsilon.$$

Proof. For sufficiently small $t_\varepsilon > 0$, the estimates (5.6) imply

$$|(\partial_\xi \otimes \partial_x \Psi)(t, x, \xi) - \text{Id}| \leq C_\varepsilon t_\varepsilon < 1/2, \quad |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \Psi(t, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} \text{ for } |\alpha + \beta| \geq 2,$$

uniformly with respect to $(t, x, \xi) \in (-t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Therefore, the assertion is a consequence of the standard L^2 -boundedness of FIO, or equivalently Kuranishi's trick and the L^2 -boundedness of PDO (see, e.g., [27] or [25, Lemma 4.2]). $\square$

We next construct the amplitude.

Proposition 5.7. *Let Ψ be the phase function as in Proposition 5.5 with ε replaced by $\varepsilon/3$. For any integer $N \geq 0$, there exist families of symbols $\{b_j(t, \cdot, \cdot); |t| < t_\varepsilon\} \subset S(\langle x \rangle^{-j} \langle \xi \rangle^{-j}, g)$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, such that $\text{supp } b_j(t, \cdot, \cdot) \subset \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$ and b_j solve the transport equations (5.5).*

Proof. We consider the case $t \geq 0$ only. Recall that a vector field $\mathcal{X}$ and function $\mathcal{Y}$ are defined by

$$\mathcal{X}(t, x, \xi) := (\partial_\xi k)(x, \partial_x \Psi(t, x, \xi)), \quad \mathcal{Y}(t, x, \xi) := -(K\Psi)(t, x, \xi),$$

respectively. Symbols b_j can be constructed in terms of a standard method of characteristics, along the flow generated by $\mathcal{X}$, as follows. For all $0 \leq s, t \leq t_\varepsilon$, we consider the solution to the following ODE:

$$\partial_t z(t, s, x, \xi) = \mathcal{X}(z(t, s, x, \xi), \xi); \quad z(s, s) = x.$$

Since $\mathcal{X}(t, x, \xi)$ is of linear type on $\Omega(\varepsilon/3)$, that is

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \mathcal{X}(t, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} \langle x \rangle^{1-|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/3),$$

by a same argument as that in the proof Lemma 5.1, $z(t, s)$ is well defined on $\Omega(\varepsilon/3)$ and satisfies

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (z(t, s, x, \xi) - x)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta\varepsilon} t_\varepsilon \langle x \rangle^{1-|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/3). \quad (5.7)$$

$b_j(t)$, $0 \leq j \leq N$, are defined inductively by

$$\begin{aligned} b_0(t, x, \xi) &= \chi_\varepsilon^*(z(0, t, x, \xi), \xi) \exp \left(\int_0^t \mathcal{Y}(s, z(s, t, x, \xi), \xi) ds \right), \\ b_j(t, x, \xi) &= - \int_0^t (iKb_{j-1})(s, z(s, t, x, \xi), \xi) \exp \left(\int_u^t \mathcal{Y}(u, z(u, t, x, \xi), \xi) du \right) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon^* \subset \Omega(\varepsilon)$, using (5.7) and a same argument as that in the proof of Lemma 5.2 (1), we see that $\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta b_j(t, x, \xi)$ are supported in $\Omega(\varepsilon/2)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$. Thus, if we extend b_j on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ so that $b_j(t, x, \xi) = 0$ outside $\Omega(\varepsilon/2)$, then b_j is still smooth in (x, ξ) . Since $\mathcal{Y}(t, x, \xi)$ satisfies

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta \mathcal{Y}(t, x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha+\beta|}, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Omega(\varepsilon/2), \quad 0 \leq t \leq t_\varepsilon,$$

$\{b_j(t, \cdot, \cdot); t \in [0, t_\varepsilon], 0 \leq j \leq N-1\}$ is a bounded set in $S(\langle x \rangle^{-j} \langle \xi \rangle^{-j}, g)$. Finally, a standard Hamilton-Jacobi theory shows that $b_j(t)$ solve the transport equations (5.5). $\square$

We now state the main result in this section.

Theorem 5.8. *Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrarily. Then, for sufficiently small $t_\varepsilon > 0$, any nonnegative integer $N \geq 0$ and any symbol $\chi_\varepsilon \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon \subset \Omega(\varepsilon)$, we can find a bounded family of symbols $\{a^N(t, \cdot, \cdot); |t| < t_\varepsilon\} \subset S(1, g)$ such that $\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^*$ can be brought to the form*

$$\text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\varepsilon)^* = J(\Psi, a^N) + Q(t, N),$$

where $J(\Psi, a^N)$ is the FIO with phase $\Psi(t, x, \xi)$ constructed in Proposition 5.5 with ε replaced by $\varepsilon/3$. The distribution kernel of $J(\Psi, a^N)$, which we denote by $K_{\Psi, a^N}(t, x, y)$, satisfies the dispersive estimate:

$$|K_{\Psi, a^N}(t, x, y)| \leq C_{N, \varepsilon} |t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| < t_\varepsilon, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Moreover, for any $\gamma \geq 0$ with $N > 2\gamma$, the remainder $Q(t, N)$ satisfies

$$\|\langle D \rangle^\gamma Q(t, N) \langle D \rangle^\gamma\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N\gamma\epsilon} |t|, \quad |t| < t_\epsilon. \quad (5.8)$$

In particular, if we choose $N \geq d + 1$, then the distribution kernel of $Q(t, N)$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with respect to $|t| < t_\epsilon$, and hence

$$\|\text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon) e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon)^*\|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C_\epsilon |t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| < t_\epsilon.$$

Proof of Theorem 5.8. We consider the case when $t \geq 0$ and the proof for $t < 0$ is similar. By virtue of Lemma 5.4, we may replace $\text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon)^*$ by $\text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon^*)$ without loss of generality. Let $b^N = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} b_j$ with b_j constructed in Proposition 5.7. Since $J(\Psi, b^N)|_{t=0} = \text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon^*)$, we have the Duhamel formula

$$\text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon) e^{-itH} \text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon^*) = \text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon) J(\Psi, b^N) + i \int_0^t \text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon) e^{-i(t-s)H} (D_t + H) J(\Psi, b^N)|_{t=s} ds.$$

Estimates on the remainder. It suffices to show that

$$\sup_{|t| < t_\epsilon} \|\langle D \rangle^\gamma \text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon) e^{-itH} (D_t + H) J(\Psi, b^N) \langle D \rangle^\gamma\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N\gamma\epsilon}.$$

Since Ψ, b_j solve the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (5.4) and transport equations (5.5), respectively, a direct computation yields

$$e^{-i\Psi(t, x, \xi)} (D_t + H) \left(e^{i\Psi(t, x, \xi)} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} b_j(t, x, \xi) \right) = r_N(t, x, \xi),$$

with some $\{r_N(t, \cdot, \cdot); 0 \leq t \leq t_\epsilon\} \subset S(\langle x \rangle^{-N} \langle \xi \rangle^{-N}, g)$. In particular,

$$(D_t + H) J(\Psi, b^N) = J(\Psi, r_N).$$

A standard L^2 -boundedness of FIO then implies

$$\sup_{|t| \leq t_\epsilon} \|\langle x \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} \langle D \rangle^{\gamma+\delta} J(\Psi, r_N) \langle D \rangle^\gamma\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N\gamma\delta},$$

for any $\gamma, \delta \geq 0$ with $2\gamma + \delta \leq N$. Since we already proved that

$$\sup_{|t| \leq t_\epsilon} \|\langle D \rangle^\gamma \text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon) e^{-itH} \langle D \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta} \langle x \rangle^{-\gamma-\delta}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{\gamma\delta},$$

we obtain the desired estimate.

Dispersive estimates. By the composition formula of PDO and FIO (cf. [27]), the composition $\text{Op}(\chi_\epsilon) J(\Psi, b^N)$ is also a FIO with the same phase Ψ and the amplitude

$$a^N(t, x, \xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{iy \cdot \eta} \chi_\epsilon(x, \eta + \tilde{\Xi}(t, x, y, \xi)) b^N(t, x + y, \xi) dy d\eta,$$

where $\tilde{\Xi}(t, x, y, \xi) = \int_0^1 (\partial_x \Psi)(t, y + \lambda(x - y), \xi) d\lambda$. By virtue of (5.6), $\tilde{\Xi}$ satisfies

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^{\alpha'} \partial_\xi^\beta (\tilde{\Xi}(t, x, y, \xi) - \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\alpha'\beta} |t|, \quad |\alpha + \alpha' + \beta| \geq 1.$$

Combining with the fact that $\chi_\varepsilon, b^N \in S(1, g)$, $\text{supp } \chi_\varepsilon \subset \Omega(\varepsilon)$ and $\text{supp } b^N(t, \cdot, \cdot) \subset \Omega(\varepsilon/2)$, we see that $\{a^N; 0 \leq t < t_\varepsilon\}$ is bounded in $S(1, g)$. The distribution kernel of $J(\Psi, a^N)$ is given by

$$K_{\Psi, a^N}(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(\Psi(t, x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi)} a^N(t, x, \xi) d\xi.$$

By virtue of Proposition 5.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|t| \leq t_\varepsilon} |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_y^\beta \partial_\xi^\gamma (\Psi(t, x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi)| &\leq C_{\alpha\beta}, \quad |\alpha + \beta + \gamma| \geq 2, \\ \partial_\xi^2 \Psi(t, x, \xi) &= -t(g^{jk}(x))_{j,k} + O(t^2), \quad |t| \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, if $t_\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough, then the phase function $\Psi(t, x, \xi) - y \cdot \xi$ has a unique non-degenerate critical point for all $|t| < t_\varepsilon$, and we can apply the stationary phase method to $K_{\Psi, a^N}(t, x, y)$. Therefore,

$$|K_{\Psi, a^N}(t, x, y)| \leq C|t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| \leq t_\varepsilon, \quad x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

which complete the proof. $\square$

6 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Suppose that H satisfies Assumption 1.1 with $\mu \geq 0$. In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.4. In view of Corollary 2.5, (1.4) is a consequence of the following proposition.

Proposition 6.1. *For any symbol $a \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and $T > 0$,*

$$\|\text{Op}_h(a)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_T h^{-1/p} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, 1]$, provided that (p, q) satisfies (1.1).

Proof. This proposition follows from the standard WKB approximation for $e^{-itH} \text{Op}_h(a)$ up to time scales of order $1/h$. The proof is essentially same as that in the case for the Laplace-Beltrami operator on compact manifolds without boundaries (see, [6, Section 2]), and we omit details. $\square$

Using this proposition, we have the semiclassical Strichartz estimates with inhomogeneous error terms:

Proposition 6.2. *Let $a \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. Then, for any $T > 0$ and any (p, q) satisfying the admissible condition (1.1),*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Op}_h(a)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} &\leq C_T \|\text{Op}_h(a)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + C_T h \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\quad + Ch^{-1/2} \|\text{Op}_h(a)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \\ &\quad + Ch^{1/2} \|[\text{Op}_h(a), H]e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, 1]$.

This proposition has been proved by [4] for the case with $V, A \equiv 0$. We give a refinement of this proposition with its proof in Section 7.

Next, we shall prove that if $k(x, \xi)$ satisfies the nontrapping condition (1.3), then the missing $1/p$ derivative can be recovered. We first recall the local smoothing effects for Schrödinger operators proved by Doi [11]. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we set $\mathcal{B}^s := \{f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d); \langle x \rangle^s f, \langle D \rangle^s f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$. Define a symbol $e_s(x, \xi)$ by

$$e_s(x, \xi) := (k(x, \xi) + |x|^2 + L(s))^{s/2} \in S((1 + |x| + |\xi|)^s, g),$$

where $L(s) > 1$ is a large constant depending on s . We denote by E_s its Weyl quantization:

$$E_s f(x) = \text{Op}^w(e_s) f(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int e^{i(x-y) \cdot \xi} e_s\left(\frac{x+y}{2}, \xi\right) f(y) dy d\xi.$$

Then, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $L(s) > 0$ such that E_s is a homeomorphism from $\mathcal{B}^{r+s}$ to $\mathcal{B}^r$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, and $(E_s)^{-1}$ is still a Weyl quantization of a symbol in $S((1 + |x| + |\xi|)^{-s}, g)$ (see, [11, Lemma 4.1]).

Proposition 6.3 (The local smoothing effects [11]). *Suppose that $k(x, \xi)$ satisfies the nontrapping condition (1.3). Then, for any $T > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$, there exists $C_{T,\sigma} > 0$ such that*

$$\|\langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma} E_{1/2} e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_{T,\sigma} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (6.1)$$

Remark 6.4. (6.1) implies a standard local smoothing effect:

$$\|\langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma} \langle D \rangle^{1/2} e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C_{T,\sigma} \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (6.2)$$

Indeed, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma} \langle D \rangle^{1/2} \\ &= \langle D \rangle^{1/2} \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma} + [\langle D \rangle^{1/2}, \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma}] \\ &= \langle D \rangle^{1/2} (E_{1/2})^{-1} E_{1/2} \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma} + [\langle D \rangle^{1/2}, \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma}] \\ &= \langle D \rangle^{1/2} (E_{1/2})^{-1} \left(\langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma} E_{1/2} + [E_{1/2}, \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma}] \right) + [\langle D \rangle^{1/2}, \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma}]. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $\langle D \rangle^{1/2} (E_{1/2})^{-1}$, $[E_{1/2}, \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma}]$ and $[\langle D \rangle^{1/2}, \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\sigma}]$ are bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ since their symbols belong to $S(1, g)$. Therefore, (6.1) implies (6.2).

Proof of (1.5) of Theorem 1.4. It is clear that (1.5) follows from Proposition 6.2, (6.2) and Corollary 2.5, since a is compactly supported with respect to x and $\{a, p\} \in S(\langle \xi \rangle, g)$, where $p = p(x, \xi)$. $\square$

7 Strichartz estimates with loss without asymptotic flatness

This section is devoted to prove Theorem 1.5. We may assume $\mu = 0$ without loss of generality. We begin with the following proposition.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $I \Subset (0, \infty)$ be an open interval and $C_0 > 0$. Then, there exist $\delta_0, h_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, $0 < h \leq h_0$, $1 \leq R \leq 1/h$ and any symbol $a_h \in S(1, g)$ supported in $\{(x, \xi); R < |x| < C_0/h, |\xi| \in I\}$, we have*

$$\| \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \text{Op}_h(a_h)^* \|_{L^1 \rightarrow L^\infty} \leq C_\delta |t|^{-d/2}, \quad 0 < |t| < \delta h R, \quad (7.1)$$

where $C_\delta > 0$ may be taken uniformly with respect to h and R .

Remark 7.2. When $|t| > 0$ in (7.1) is small and independent of R , then Proposition 7.1 is well-known and the proof is given by the standard method of the short-time WKB approximation for $e^{-itH^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a_h)^*$ (see, e.g., [6]).

For $h \in (0, 1]$, $R \geq 1$, an open interval $I \Subset (0, \infty)$ and $C_0 > 0$, we set

$$\Gamma(R, h, I) := \{(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}; R < |x| < C_0/h, |\xi| \in I\}.$$

Proposition 7.1 is a consequence of the same argument in the proof of Proposition 3.1 and the following proposition, which is a refinement of the standard WKB approximation for the semiclassical Schrödinger propagator:

Proposition 7.3. *Let $I \Subset I_1 \Subset (0, \infty)$ and $C_0 > 0$. Then, there exist $\delta_0, h_0 > 0$ such that the followings hold for any $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, $0 < h \leq h_0$ and $1 \leq R \leq C_0/h$.*

(1) *There exists $\Phi_h(t, x, \xi) \in C^\infty((-\delta R, \delta R) \times \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ such that Φ_h solves the following Hamilton-Jacobi equation:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \Phi_h(t, x, \xi) = -p_h(x, \partial_x \Phi_h(t, x, \xi)), & |t| < \delta R, (x, \xi) \in \Gamma(R/2, h/2, I_1), \\ \Phi_h(0, x, \xi) = x \cdot \xi, & (x, \xi) \in \Gamma(R/2, h/2, I_1), \end{cases} \quad (7.2)$$

where p_h is defined in the beginning of Section 2. Moreover, we have

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\Phi_h(t, x, \xi) - x \cdot \xi + t p_h(x, \xi))| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} R^{-|\alpha|} h |t|^2, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d, \quad (7.3)$$

uniformly with respect to $x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $h \in (0, h_0]$, $0 \leq R \leq C_0/h$ and $|t| < \delta R$.

(2) *For any $a \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } a \in \Gamma(R, h, I)$ and any integer $N \geq 0$, we can find $b_h^N(t, \cdot, \cdot) \in S(1, g)$ such that*

$$e^{-it\tilde{H}^h/h} \text{Op}_h(a)^* = J_h(\Phi_h, b_h^N) + Q_{\text{WKB}}(t, h, N),$$

where $J_h(\Phi_h, b_h^N)$ is the h -FIO with the phase function Φ_h and the amplitude b_h^N , and its distribution kernel satisfies

$$|K_{\text{WKB}}(t, h, x, y)| \leq C |th|^{-d/2}, \quad h \in (0, h_0], \quad 0 < |t| \leq \delta R, \quad x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (7.4)$$

Moreover the remainder $Q_{\text{WKB}}(t, h, N)$ satisfies

$$\| \langle D \rangle^s Q_{\text{WKB}}(t, h, N) \langle D \rangle^s \|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq C_{N,s} h^{N-2s} |t|, \quad h \in (0, h_0], \quad |t| \leq \delta R.$$

Sketch of the proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 5.8 and, in particular, the proof of the second claim is completely same. Thus, we give only the outline of the construction of Φ_h . We may assume $C_0 = 1$ without losing generality. Let us denote by (X_h, Ξ_h) the Hamilton flow generated by p_h . To construct the phase function, the most important step is to study the inverse map of $(x, \xi) \mapsto (X_h(t, x, \xi), \xi)$. Choose an open interval $\tilde{I}_1$ so that $I_1 \Subset \tilde{I}_1 \Subset (0, \infty)$. The following bounds have been proved by [25]:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (X_h(t, x, \xi) - x)| + \langle x \rangle |\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (\Xi_h(t, x, \xi) - \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} |t|,$$

for $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma(R/3, h/3, \tilde{I}_1)$ and $|t| \leq \delta R$. For sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and for any fixed $|t| \leq \delta R$, the above estimates imply

$$|\partial_x X_h(t) - \text{Id}| \leq CR^{-1}|t| \leq C\delta < 1/2.$$

By the same argument as that in the proof of Lemma 5.2, the map $(x, \xi) \mapsto (X_h(t, x, \xi), \xi)$ is a diffeomorphism from $\Gamma(R/3, h/3, \tilde{I}_1)$ onto its range, and that the corresponding inverse $(x, \xi) \mapsto (Y_h(t, x, \xi), \xi)$ is well-defined for $|t| < \delta R$ and $(x, \xi) \in \Gamma(R/2, h/2, I_1)$. Moreover, $X_h(t)$ satisfies the same estimates as that for $X_h(t)$:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (Y_h(t, x, \xi) - x)| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} |t|, \quad |t| < \delta R, \quad (x, \xi) \in \Gamma(R/2, h/2, I_1)$$

We now define Φ_h by

$$\Phi_h(t, x, \xi) := x \cdot \xi + \int_0^t L_h(X_h(s, Y(t, x, \xi), \xi), \Xi(s, y(t, x, \xi), \xi)) ds,$$

where $L_h = \xi \cdot \partial_\xi p_h - p_h$. By the standard Hamilton-Jacobi theory, Φ_h solves (7.2). Moreover, using the estimates on x_h, ξ_h and y_h , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |p_h(\partial_x \Phi_h, \xi) - p_h(x, \xi)| &\leq |y(t) - x| \left| \int_0^\lambda (\partial_x p_h)(\lambda y_h(t) - (1 - \lambda)x, \xi) d\lambda \right| \\ &\leq C|y(t) - x|(h + h^2 \langle x \rangle^2) \\ &\leq Ch|t|, \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (p_h(\partial_x \Phi_h, \xi) - p_h(x, \xi))| \leq C_{\alpha\beta} \langle x \rangle^{-|\alpha|} h|t|.$$

Using these estimates, we can check that Φ_h satisfies (7.3). Finally, we extend Φ_h to the whole space so that $\Phi_h(t, x, \xi) = x \cdot \xi - tp_h(x, \xi)$ outside $\Gamma(R/3, h/3, \tilde{I}_1)$. $\square$

Using Proposition 7.1, we obtain a refinement of Proposition 6.2:

Proposition 7.4. *Let $0 < R \leq 1/h$ and let $a \in S(1, g)$ be supported in $\{(x, \xi); R < |x| < 1/h, |\xi| \in I\}$. Then, for any $T > 0$ and (p, q) satisfying the admissible condition (1.1)*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} &\leq C_T \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + C_T h \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\quad + C_T (hR)^{-1/2} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} \\ &\quad + C_T (hR)^{1/2} \| [H, \text{Op}_h(a_h)] e^{-itH}\varphi \|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [4, Proposition 5.4]. By time reversal invariance we can restrict our considerations to the interval $[0, T]$. We may assume $T \geq hR$ without loss of generality and split $[0, T]$ as follows: $[0, T] = J_0 \cup J_1 \cup \dots \cup J_N$, where $J_j = [jhR, (j+1)hR]$, $0 \leq j \leq N-1$, and $J_N = [T - \delta hR, T]$. For $j = 0$, we have the Duhamel formula

$$\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH} = e^{-itH} \text{Op}_h(a_h) - i \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H} [\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] e^{-isH} ds, \quad t \in J_0.$$

We here choose $b_h \in S(1, g)$ so that $b_h \equiv 1$ on $\text{supp } a$ and b_h is supported in a sufficiently small neighborhood of $\text{supp } a$. By Proposition 7.1, $\text{Op}_h(b_h)e^{-i(t-s)H} \text{Op}_h(b_h)$ satisfies dispersive estimates (7.1) for $0 < |t-s| < \delta hR$ with some $\delta > 0$ small enough. Using the Keel-Tao theorem [20] and the unitarity of e^{-itH} , we then learn that for any interval J_R of size $|J_R| \leq 2hR$, the following homogeneous and inhomogeneous Strichartz estimates hold uniformly with respect to $h \in (0, h_0]$:

$$\|\text{Op}_h(b_h)e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^p(J_R; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C\|\varphi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (7.5)$$

$$\left\| \int_0^t F(s \in J_R) \text{Op}_h(b_h)e^{-i(t-s)H} \text{Op}_h(b_h)^* g(s) ds \right\|_{L^p(J_R; L^q(\mathbb{R}^d))} \leq C\|g\|_{L^1(J_R; L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))}. \quad (7.6)$$

On the other hand, using the expansions (2.3) and (2.4), we see that for any integer $M \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Op}_h(a_h) &= \text{Op}_h(b_h) \text{Op}_h(a_h) + h^M \text{Op}_h(r_1) \\ &= \text{Op}_h(b_h)^* \text{Op}_h(a_h) + h^M \text{Op}_h(r_2), \\ [\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] &= \text{Op}_h(b_h)^* [\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] + h^M \text{Op}_h(r_3), \end{aligned}$$

with some $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-M} \langle \xi \rangle^{-M}, g)$. Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH} &= \text{Op}_h(b_h)e^{-itH} \text{Op}_h(a_h) \\ &\quad - i \int_0^t \text{Op}_h(b_h)e^{-i(t-s)H} \text{Op}_h(b_h)^* [\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] e^{-isH} ds \\ &\quad + Q(t, h, M), \end{aligned}$$

where the remainder $Q(t, h, M)$ satisfies

$$\|Q(t, h, M)\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^q} \leq C_M h^{M-1-d(1/2-1/q)}, \quad 2 \leq q \leq \infty,$$

uniformly in $h \in (0, 1]$. Combining this estimate with (7.5) and (7.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\|_{L^p(J_0; L^q)} \\ &\leq C\|\text{Op}_h(a_h)\varphi\|_{L^2} + Ch\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C\|[\text{Op}_h(a_h), H]e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^1(J_0; L^2)} \\ &\leq C\|\text{Op}_h(a_h)\varphi\|_{L^2} + Ch\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C(hR)^{1/2}\|[\text{Op}_h(a_h), H]e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^2(J_0; L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

We similarly obtain the same bound for $j = N$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\text{Op}_h(a_h)e^{-itH}\|_{L^p(J_N; L^q)} \\ &\leq C\|\text{Op}_h(a_h)\varphi\|_{L^2} + Ch\|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C(hR)^{1/2}\|[\text{Op}_h(a_h), H]e^{-itH}\varphi\|_{L^2(J_N; L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $j = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, taking $\theta \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\theta \equiv 1$ on $[-1/2, 1/2]$ and $\text{supp } \theta \subset [-1, 1]$, we set $\theta_j(t) = \theta(t/(hR) - j - 1/2)$. It is easy to see that $\theta_j \equiv 1$ on J_j and $\text{supp } \theta_j \subset \tilde{J}_j = J_j + [-hR/2, hR/2]$. We consider $v_j = \theta_j(t) \text{Op}_h(a) e^{-itH} \varphi$, which solves

$$i\partial_t v_j = H v_j + \theta'_j \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi + \theta_j [\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] e^{-itH} \varphi; \quad v_j|_{t=0} = 0.$$

The Duhamel formula then yields

$$v_j = -i \int_0^t \text{Op}_h(b_h) e^{-i(t-s)H} \text{Op}_h(b_h)^* (\theta'_j(s) \text{Op}_h(a_h) + \theta_j(s) [\text{Op}_h(a_h), H]) e^{-isH} \varphi ds,$$

for $t \in \tilde{J}_j$, which, combined the same argument as above, implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \|v_j\|_{L^p(J_j; L^q)} \\ & \leq Ch^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C(hR)^{-1} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^1(\tilde{J}_j; L^2)} + C \|[\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^1(\tilde{J}_j; L^2)} \\ & \leq Ch^2 \|\varphi\|_{L^2} + C(hR)^{-1/2} \|\text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}_j; L^2)} \\ & \quad + C(hR)^{1/2} \|[\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2(\tilde{J}_j; L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over $j = 0, 1, \dots, N$, since $N \leq T/h$ and $p \geq 2$, we have the assertion by Minkowski's inequality. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. In view of Corollary 2.5, Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 3.2, it suffices to show that, for any $a_h \in S(1, g)$ with $\text{supp } a_h \in \{(x, \xi); 2 \leq |x| \leq 1/h, |\xi| \in I\}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_h \|\text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} f(h^2 H) \varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q)}^2 \leq C_{T, \varepsilon} \|\langle H \rangle^\varepsilon \varphi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Let us consider a dyadic partition of unity:

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq j_h} \chi(2^{-j} x) = 1, \quad 2 \leq |x| \leq 1/h,$$

where $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\text{supp } \chi \subset \{1/2 < |x| < 2\}$ and $j_h \leq [\log(1/h)] + 1$. We set $\chi_j(x) = \chi(2^{-j} x)$. Proposition 7.4 then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_j \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q)} & \leq C_T \|\chi_j \text{Op}_h(a_h) \varphi\|_{L^2} + C_T h \|\varphi\|_{L^2} \\ & \quad + C_T (h2^j)^{-1/2} \|\chi_j \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)} \\ & \quad + C_T (h2^j)^{1/2} \|[\chi_j \text{Op}_h(a_h), H] e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

Since $2^{j-1} \leq |x| \leq 2^{j+1}$ and $|x| \leq 1/h$ on $\text{supp } \chi_j a_h$ we have, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (h2^j)^{-1/2} \|\chi_j \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)} \\ & \leq C \|\chi_j \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\varepsilon} h^{-1/2-\varepsilon} \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\chi_j a_h, p\} \in S(\langle x \rangle^{-1} \langle \xi \rangle, g)$, we similarly obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & (h2^j)^{1/2} \|\chi_j [\text{Op}_h(a_h), H] e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)} \\ & \leq \|\tilde{\chi}_j \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\varepsilon} h^{-1/2-\varepsilon} \text{Op}_h(b_h) e^{-itH} \varphi\|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)} + C_T h \|\varphi\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\chi}_j(x) = \tilde{\chi}(2^{-j}x)$ for some $\tilde{\chi} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $\tilde{\chi} \equiv 1$ on $[1/2, 2]$ and $\text{supp } \tilde{\chi} \subset [1/4, 4]$, and $b_h \in S(1, g)$ is supported in a neighborhood of $\text{supp } a_h$ so that $b_h \equiv 1$ on $\text{supp } a_h$. Summing over $1 \leq j \leq j_h$ and using local smoothing effects (6.2), since $p, q \geq 2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \| \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi \|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q)}^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq j_h} \| \chi_j \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} \varphi \|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q)}^2 \\
& \leq C_T \sum_{1 \leq j \leq j_h} (\| \chi_j \text{Op}_h(a_h) \varphi \|_{L^2}^2 + h \| \varphi \|_{L^2}^2) \\
& + C \sum_{1 \leq j \leq j_h} \| \tilde{\chi}_j \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\varepsilon} h^{-1/2-\varepsilon} \text{Op}_h(a_h + b_h) e^{-itH} \varphi \|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)}^2 \\
& \leq C_T \| \varphi \|_{L^2}^2 + C \| \langle x \rangle^{-1/2-\varepsilon} h^{-1/2-\varepsilon} \text{Op}_h(a_h + b_h) e^{-itH} \varphi \|_{L^2([-T, T]; L^2)}^2 \\
& \leq C_{T, \varepsilon} h^{-2\varepsilon} \| \varphi \|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_h \| \text{Op}_h(a_h) e^{-itH} f(h^2 H) \varphi \|_{L^p([-T, T]; L^q)}^2 & \leq C_{T, \varepsilon} \sum_h h^{-2\varepsilon} \| f(h^2 H) \varphi \|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \leq C_{T, \varepsilon} \| \langle H \rangle^{\varepsilon/2} \varphi \|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof. $\square$

References

- [1] Bouclet, J.- M.: *Littlewood-Paley decompositions on manifolds with ends*. Bull. Soc. Math. France. **138** (2010), 1–37.
- [2] Bouclet, J.- M.: *Semi-classical calculus on non compact manifolds with ends and weighted L^p estimates*. Ann. Inst. Fourier. **61**(2011), 1181–1223.
- [3] Bouclet, J.-M.: *Strichartz estimates on asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds*. Anal. PDE. **4** (2011), 1–84.
- [4] Bouclet, J.-M., Tzvetkov, N.: *Strichartz estimates for long range perturbations*. Amer. J. Math. **129** (2007), 1565–1609.
- [5] Bouclet, J.-M., Tzvetkov, N.: *On global Strichartz estimates for non trapping metrics*. J. Funct. Analysis. **254** (2008), 1661–1682.
- [6] Burq, N., Gérard, P., Tzvetkov, N.: *Strichartz inequalities and the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on compact manifolds*. Amer. J. Math. **126** (2004), 569–605.
- [7] Burq, N., Guillarmou, C., Hassell, A.: *Strichartz estimates without loss on manifolds with hyperbolic trapped geodesics*. Geom. Funct. Anal. **20** (2010), 627–656.
- [8] Cazenave, T.: *Semilinear Schrödinger equations*. Courant. Lect. Notes Math. vol. 10, AMS, Providence, RI, 2003.

- [9] D’Ancona, P., Fanelli, L.: *Smoothing estimates for the Schrödinger equation with unbounded potentials* J. Differential Equations **246** (2009), 4552–4567.
- [10] D’Ancona, P., Fanelli, L., Vega, L., Visciglia, N.: *Endpoint Strichartz estimates for the magnetic Schrödinger equation*. J. Funct. Analysis **258** (2010), 3227–3240.
- [11] Doi, S.: *Smoothness of solutions for Schrödinger equations with unbounded potentials*. Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **41** (2005), 175–221.
- [12] Erdoğan, M., Goldberg, M., Schlag, W.: *Strichartz and smoothing estimates for Schrödinger operators with almost critical magnetic potentials in three and higher dimensions*. Forum Math. **21** (2009), 687–722.
- [13] Fujiwara, D.: *Remarks on convergence of the Feynman path integrals*. Duke Math. J. **47** (1980), 559–600.
- [14] Gerard, C., Martinez, A.: *Prolongement méromorphe de la matrice de scattering pour des problèmes à deux corps à longue portée*. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor. **5** (1989), 81–100.
- [15] Ginibre, J., Velo, G.: *The global Cauchy problem for the non linear Schrödinger equation*. Ann. IHP-Analyse non linéaire. **2** (1985), 309–327.
- [16] Hassell, A., Tao, T., Wunsch, J.: *Sharp Strichartz estimates on nontrapping asymptotically conic manifolds*. Amer. J. Math. **128** (2006), 963–1024.
- [17] Helffer, B., Sjöstrand, J.: *Equation de Schrödinger avec champ magnétique et équation de Harper*. In Schrödinger Operators, H. Holden and A. Jensen, eds., pp. 118–197. Lecture Notes in Physics 345, Springer-Verlag, 1989
- [18] Isozaki, H., Kitada, H.: *Modified wave operators with time independent modifiers*. J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo. **32** (1985), 77–104.
- [19] Journé, J.-L., Soffer, A., Sogge, C. D.: *Decay estimates for Schrödinger operators*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44** (1991), 573–604.
- [20] Keel, M., Tao, T.: *Endpoint Strichartz Estimates*. Amer. J. Math. **120** (1998), 955–980.
- [21] Kitada, H., Kumano-go, H.: *A family of Fourier integral operators and the fundamental solution for a Schrödinger equation*. Osaka J. Math. **18** (1981), 291–360.
- [22] Martinez, A.: *An Introduction to Semiclassical and Microlocal Analysis*. New York: Universitext, Springer-Verlag, 2002
- [23] Marzuola, J., Metcalfe, J., Tataru, D.: *Strichartz estimates and local smoothing estimates for asymptotically flat Schrödinger equations*. J. Funct. Analysis. **255** (2008), 1497–1553.
- [24] Mizutani, H.: *Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations on scattering manifolds*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations. **37** (2012), 169–224.

- [25] Mizutani, H.: *Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with variable coefficients and potentials at most linear at spatial infinity*. Submitted. (<http://arxiv.org/abs/1108.2103>)
- [26] Robbiano, L., Zuily, C.: *Strichartz estimates for Schrödinger equations with variable coefficients*. Mém. SMF. Math. Fr. (N.S.), No. 101–102, 1–208 (2005)
- [27] Robert, D.: Autour de l’approximation semi-classique. *Progr. Math.* **68** Birkhäuser, Basel, 1987
- [28] Robert, D.: *Relative time delay for perturbations of elliptic operators and semiclassical asymptotics*. J. Funct. Analysis **126** (1994), 36–82.
- [29] Robert, D., Tamura, H.: *Semi-classical estimates for resolvents and asymptotics for total scattering cross-sections*. Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré 46 (1987), 415–442.
- [30] Schlag, W.: *Dispersive estimates for Schrödinger operators: a survey*. Mathematical aspects of nonlinear dispersive equations, Ann. of Math. Stud. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ. **163** (2007), 255–285
- [31] Staffilani, G., Tataru, D.: *Strichartz estimates for a Schrödinger operator with non smooth coefficients*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations. **27** (2002), 1337–1372.
- [32] Strichartz, R.: *Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations*. Duke Math. J. **44** (1977), 705–714.
- [33] Tataru, D.: *Parametrices and dispersive estimates for Schrödinger operators with variable coefficients*. Amer. J. Math. **130** (2008), 571–634.
- [34] Yajima, K.: *Existence of solutions for Schrödinger evolution equations*. Comm Math. Phys. **110** (1987), 415–426.
- [35] Yajima, K.: *Schrödinger evolution equation with magnetic fields*. J. d’Anal. Math. **56** (1991), 29–76.
- [36] Yajima, K.: *Boundedness and continuity of the fundamental solution of the time dependent Schrödinger equation with singular potentials*. Tohoku Math. J. **50** (1988), 577–595.
- [37] Yajima, K.: *Dispersive estimates for Schrödinger equations with threshold resonance and eigenvalue*. Comm. Math. Phys. **259** (2005), 475–509.
- [38] Yajima, K., Zhang, G.: *Local smoothing property and Strichartz inequality for Schrödinger equations with potentials superquadratic at infinity*. J. Differential Equations. **202** (2004), 81–110.